DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 769 CE 059 961

AUTHOR	Luke, Robert A.
TITLE	The NEA and Adult Education. A Historical Review: 1921-1972.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	396p.
PUB TYPE	Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Education; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Trends; *National Organizations; Postsecondary Education; *Professional Associations; *Program Development; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Association

ABSTRACT

As this historical review shows, the National Education Association (NEA) was one of the principal contributors to the development of adult education in the United States. The report describes NEA's direct involvement through the lifespan of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education (1921-1924); the NEA Department of Adult Education (1924-1951); the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, an NEA department (1952-1972); the Division of Adult Education Service (1945-1971); the National Training Laboratory in Group Development (1947-1970); and the Adult Education Committee of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (1959-1975). This report covers 50 years of the history of NEA and adult education. Some of the developments it describes include the following: (1) the characteristics of the NEA departments; (2) the part played by the Carnegie Corporation in funding the NEA Department of Immigrant Education; (3) the founding of the American Association for Adult Education; (4) leadership changes and mergers among departments and associations; (5) the role of the NEA and the Fund for Adult Education in strengthening the role of adult education in state departments of education; and (6) the story of two persons in the NEA who started from the same philosophic understanding of adult education, and what happened when they began to move in different directions. The report includes commentary from a long-time NEA staff member and department director. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341769

THE NEA AND ADULT EDUCATION

A HISTORICAL REVIEW: 1921 - 1972

Robert A. Luke
1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R A Luke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 059961

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c Robert A. Luke
1992
All Rights Reserved
Further reproduction in whole or part by
permission only.

DEDICATION

To the pioneers, many of whose names are mentioned herein,
who helped fashion the profession of adult education

and

To the members of the National Education Association
without whose support at critical times
much of this story of a significant part of the
adult education movement could not have been written

ABSTRACT

The absence of any prior, detailed examination of the role of the National Education Association (NEA) in adult education represents a gap both in the literature of adult education and of public education. For more than fifty years, the NEA was one of the principal contributors to the development of adult education in the United States. It takes its place with the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Fund for Adult Education as an influential force in the molding of a national movement.

NEA's direct involvement covered the life-span of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education (1921-1924); the NEA Department of Adult Education (1924-1951); the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, (NAPSAE), an NEA Department, (1952-1972); the Division of Adult Education Service (1945-1971); the National Training Laboratory in Group Development (NTL), (1947-1970); and the Adult Education Committee of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP), (1959-1975). Over a fifty-one year period, NEA invested in adult education related activities a conservatively estimated million and a quarter dollars, as measured in the currency of the time.

In 1945, following the enactment by the U.S. Congress of the Servicemens Readjustment Act of 1944 (the "G.I. Bill"), the NEA established an administrative unit, the Division of Adult

Education Service. In addition to other duties, senior members of the Division's staff served as adjunct staff members of the Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA) during its formative years * and in executive staff roles of NAPSAE and the WCOTP Adult Education Committee. The first director of the Division was the founder of NTL.

The study expands on the historical information presently available about NEA's adult education involvements, corrects some commonly-held misunderstandings, and candidly reports on those activities of the Division of Adult Education that time has proved worthy of remembrance--and also those that forty years of hindsight suggests were questionable.

The study documents and describes:

1. The characteristics of the independent, voluntary associations known as NEA "departments" and the reasons for their being organized.
2. The part played by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in the founding of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education in 1921.
3. The involvement of adult educators employed by state and local school systems in the founding of the American Association for Adult education (AAAE) in 1926.
4. The role of the NEA in helping hold the AEA together until

---

*At no time was AEA organizationally affiliated with NEA.

the first grant from the Fund for Adult Education was received.

5. Leadership changes in the NEA Department of Adult Education immediately following the end of World War II that turned a quarter-century pattern of cooperation between the AAAE and the Department into one of ill-advised confrontation.
6. The unnecessary dismantling of the NEA Department of Adult Education and of the AAAE to form a new association (AEA) that would soon result in two organizations similar to those that had been abolished.
7. The writing of three drafts of an Educational Policies Commission statement on Adult Education and why the document was never published.
8. How the pursuit of applied group dynamics by the Division of Adult Education Service both advanced and stalled the growth of the adult education movement in the United States.
9. The partnership of NEA and the Fund for Adult Education in strengthening and expanding the role of adult education in state departments of education.
10. How the NEA helped secure passage of the Adult Education Act. (Title II of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1966).
11. Influence and support of the NEA on adult education worldwide.

12. The genesis within the NEA of the Work Conference model of conferencing and of the annual sessions of NTL at Bethel, Maine.

13. Why the NEA discontinued its support of the Division of Adult Education Service in 1972.

14. The lasting legacy of the NEA as represented by:

    a. The existence today of adult basic education programs in most school districts and the employment of supervisory personnel in all state departments of education.

    b. A national network of behavioral scientists who, as part of the privately sponsored NTL Institute, provides consultative training in the theory and practice of applied group dynamics.

The history is also the story of two individuals who started from the same philosophic understanding of adult education - and what happened as they began to move in quite different directions.

The author served as assistant director and then director of the Division of Adult Education Service, assistant secretary of the Department of Adult Education, executive secretary of NAPSAE, secretary of the WCOTP Adult Education Committee, and an NTL staff member.

CONTENTS

Dedication.. iii

Contents.. v

Foreword.. vii

Prologue.. xiii

Chapter

I. NEA: The Super Holding Company 1

II. The Division of Adult Education Service 15

III. The Department of Immigrant Education 51

IV. The Department of Adult Education: Years of Tranquility 69

V. The American Association for Adult Education 90

VI. Roots of Conflict: 1938-1943 103

VII. Advent of the Work Conference 131

VIII. Issues and Consequences: 1942-1951 158

IX. The NEA and the Adult Education Association 192

X. The National Association of Public School Adult Educators: The Starting Points 225

XI. The National Association of Public School Adult Educators. Program 253

XII. The National Training Laboratories in Group Development 291

XIII. International Outreach 318

XIV. Transitions 341

About the Author 372

FOREWORD

After I retired from the NEA in 1979, I sometimes said to former colleagues, "The National Education Association has been one of the major contributors to the growth of the adult education movement in the United States. It should take its place," I continued, "with the Carnegie Corporation and the Fund for Adult Education as one of the more significant forces in aiding and influencing the movement." To this, I would usually add, "not only was it one of the earliest (1921) sources of financial support for a national adult education organization but it became a generous contributor of in-kind financial assistance to one national association in which it had no direct interest. The length of time it gave direct support to several national adult education organizations in which it did have an interest--and to the National Training Laboratories--extended over more years than those of Carnegie and the Fund combined."

Such a declaration was usually met, not with disbelief, but with a request for additional information.

The opportunity to compile such a chronicle came unexpectedly in the summer of 1989. It arrived in the form of an invitation from the chair of the Visiting Scholar Committee of the Kellogg Adult Education Project at Syracuse University to submit an application to attend a history conference. The conference would not only be an occasion to meet other individuals interested in exploring some aspect of the historical base of adult education, but would provide an opportunity to consult the Adult and Continuing Education Research Collection of the University. The application was to be accompanied by a statement describing proposed research.

It was only then I began to outline, as part of my application, an account of the contribution of the National Education Association to adult education. As I moved further into the study, the Kellogg Project underwrote two additional visits to Syracuse which enabled me to continue my research.

Many members of the Kellogg Project staff contributed to the enjoyable and profitable weeks I spent in Syracuse. My special words of thanks go to those responsible for getting me there: Roger Hiemstra, professor of adult education and director of the Kellogg Project, and Rae Rohfeld, associate professor and chair of the Visiting Scholar Committee.

The National Education Association made it possible for me to draw on the resources of NEA Archives, the George Washington University Library, and the Library of Congress. The NEA also assisted in meeting some of the production costs. I am grateful for the assistance provided by Donald Walker who retired early in 1991 as manager of Records Management and Archives. Thanks for special assistance are also due Howard G. Belton, director of Internal Operations at NEA and his administrative manager, Janice Jackson.

Each chapter has been reviewed by individuals knowledgeable about the events treated in various sections of the history. Of particular help were, for that part of the account dealing with the NEA, William G. Carr, former executive secretary of the NEA and Lyle W. Ashby, former deputy executive secretary.

Readers who commented from the perspective of adult education--and who had a major part in many of the events described in the following pages--were Robert J. Blakely, former vice-president of the Fund for Adult education and Malcolm S. Knowles, first executive director of the Adult Education Association (AEA) of the USA and author of the standard history of the field.

Kenneth Benne, one of the founders of the National Training Laboratory and active in both the NEA Department of Adult Education and the AEA, reviewed and commented on those chapters which referenced the National Training Laboratories and the magazine Adult Leadership, of which he was an editorial consultant.

Others who reviewed various chapters and contributed either source material or manuscript criticism were Alexander Charters, Richard Cortwright, William Griffith, John Holden, Cyril Houle, Carl Minich, James Miller, Roy Minnis, Leonard Nadler, James Parker, Rose Mary Pattison, Sherry Royce, Robert Schenz, Carol Chuleu and Harold Stubblefield. I extend my thanks along with the assurance that I accept full responsibility for all opinions expressed.

Robert A. Luke, jr., a member of the faculty of the NTL Institute and known in both adult education and human resource development circles (and who advised me against trying to define either of those terms or such others as "community normative behavior,: "training-education-development," or "androgogy.") has provided invaluable assistance by serving as the kind of friend against whose more recent experience ideas can be shaped and conclusions tested.

Two of the references quoted most frequently are Leland Bradford's National Training Laboratories: Its History: 1947-1970 and volumes of the NEA Proceedings. I gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of Martha Bradford in granting permission to quote extensively from her late husband's long and comprehensive report. Lyle Ashby, now of Venice, Florida, granted access whenever it was needed to his extensive collection of the NEA Proceedings. (Because of the frequency with which the Proceedings are quoted, a short title is used in the reference following each chapter. The full citation would read: National Education Association. Addresses and Proceedings, [date], Washington, D.C.: the Association, [date and page.])

My wife Jeanne, aided in the overall planning of the manuscript and provided editorial assistance throughout the time it took for it to be produced. As of this date she is looking forward to the time when she can believe her husband is retired and living in Florida.

Jeannette Crissey not only typed all the pages in the final draft--but many of them many times. She also has been of continuing help in the final editing.

The Selby Library in Sarasota, Florida has been great about arranging for the many inter-library loans required to complete this work. Patricia Cahill, curator of the Carnegie Corporation archives at Columbia University and Alan Divack, assistant archivist at the Ford Foundation, have assisted in retrieving information from those collections.

Financial data presented at various times throughout the text has been drawn from the annual reports of the NEA Budget Committee included in each volume of the Proceedings.

Although the National Association of Public School Adult Educators changed its name twice in the course of its history, this account deals primarily with its origin and early years. To avoid confusion the original name is used throughout except in bibliographic notations.

In concluding these introductory remarks, I wish to acknowledge my great debt of gratitude to the late Leland P. Bradford, the first director of the NEA Division of Adult Education Service. By employing me, he helped set the course for a career that made every day of the week one worth going into work. By gradually freeing me from the direction he had hoped I would take--and permitting me to follow the course it seemed to me the NEA should pursue, he made it possible for the NEA to become a recognizable landmark for all adventurers charting a course through either the areas of adult education or of the behavioral sciences.

Although neither Bradford nor I realized it at the time, the ability of one administrative unit to move in quite different directions at the same time was simply in line with NEA's historic mandate: "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States." To that might be added, "in all ways possible."

Robert A. Luke
Sarasota, Florida
February 15, 1992

Prologue

RECTIFYING UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The concept of political democracy has much in common with the concept of public education. A democracy requires educated citizens who can think for themselves and act upon their own, informed initiatives. That the second condition does not always follow the first in no way invalidates the premise; no more than the idea of free, public, universal education guarantees that all individuals will have equal access to educational opportunity.

Obstacles to Equal Access

The obstacles standing in the way of full realization of the ideal are many and great. In the United States, the provision and management of publicly supported education is a constitutional obligation of the states. Yet the 50 states vary widely in both material and human resources. As a consequence, they vary equally widely in their ability to provide equal educational opportunities for all of their citizens.

Individual differences in intelligence, ambition, perseverance, home-environment and the other qualities and conditions required to make the most of the educational opportunities available--and the attendant ability to rationally and intelligently think for one's self, vary even more widely. Historically, discrepancies in equal opportunity have been further aggravated as a result of community standards which, until the advent of the Civil Rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's, denied some whole classes of individuals access to any education.*

From the time the Pilgrims landed on the coast of Massachusetts until the present day, the United States has been a self-proclaimed Melting Pot. For 300 years, from 1620 to 1921, with one major exception, first the Colonies, and then the United States, permitted all but unlimited immigration, especially from European countries. (The exception was the Oriental Exclusion Acts, the first of which was passed in 1881). The result of this heavy immigration was to absorb into the culture masses of children, youths and adults, many with no knowledge of the English Language, and all faced with the problems of adjusting to a new country. Helping the newcomers make the necessary accommodations became an obligation shared by public and private educational and social agencies. "Naturalization" and "Americanization" programs were designed to provide immigrants with the tools required not only to achieve a piece of the American Dream for themselves, but to enter into participation in democratic processes as responsible citizens. Community sanction for the support of Americanization and Citizenship programs was enforced by an all too evident suspicion of "foreigners", even those who were Caucasians, but who lacked knowledge of the "American Way", i.e., the country's customs, cultural habits, and political structure.

---

*Early in the 1950's I was told on the floor of the Mississippi House of Representatives by the legislator to whom I was speaking that the district the legislator represented was in a part of the state where neither blacks nor alligators were sent to school.

"The Adult Educator's Burden"

The burden for rectifying the consequences of missed educational opportunity, whether it be inadequately supported elementary and secondary schools; late blooming individual motivation; the problems of adapting to the culture of a strange, new country; involuntary servitude; or a variety of other reasons, has been, and still remains, a task assigned to those willing and prepared to undertake the education of adults. Most specifically, the teachers willing to accept and understand the circumstances entailed in setting up learning experiences different from those required for the education of children.

Another obstacle is then encountered: the education of adults has historically been the least favored segment of the educational spectrum in terms of fiscal support. Although public awareness has changed greatly in the last fifty years, in the 1920's when the adult education movement was beginning to take on an identity of its own, "adult education" was commonly perceived by those adults called upon to support it as something required only by others.*

It was not uncommon to hear an individual say, "I received my education at (for example) Kennesaw Junior College, where did you receive yours?" An "education" was all too often thought of as a one-time opportunity which, if squandered--no matter what the reason--was to be considered a lost opportunity. Until the democratization of many social institutions reached a crest in the 1950's, acceptance of the need for spending limited public funds for the education of adults seldom reached beyond a willingness to pay for Americanization and Citizenship programs and for limited vocational and literacy education. Even then, a large share of the effort had to be borne by religious groups and privately supported charities or settlement houses.

The Preeminence of the Teacher

The fact that any literacy or Americanization and Citizenship education existed at all was frequently due to the after-hour efforts of volunteers, many of whom were teachers in the public schools. This was both a cause for and an effect of, the attention the National Education Association directed toward these programs. In reporting on "Who Talked About What" at NEA conventions, Edgar B. Wesley reports that, "The problem of illiteracy among the freedmen and the whites of the South provoked an almost evangelical fervor for two decades after the Civil War. The topic then declined in popularity as a subject for discussion although it was restored for a short time after the First World War when Cora Wilson Stewart popularized the cause through the Moonlight Schools."[1]

---

*In the late forties, when I was employed by the Cincinnati Adult Education Council, I was requested to speak before a women's club on "adult education". I prepared the usual talk: the only thing that is constant is change ... the need for an informed citizenry ... etc. Afterwards I was informed by the disappointed chair that what the members had expected was a review of what was being done for the foreigners in the city.

It must be said, however, that even after the First World War, in actual practice the literacy programs that predominated were those enrolling the "whites of the South", not the former slaves or their progeny. In Cora Wilson Stewart's story of the Moonlight Schools* in Eastern Kentucky in the second decade of the century there is no reference to work among the blacks. This comes as no surprise since racial segregation was rigorously enforced at all levels of society. Of the 26 fine, rare photographs in the book, all are of Caucasian groups and all of "whites of the South" except one of "Mexican mothers in California learning to read and write" and another of immigrant "Jewish mothers in New York improving their education."

---

*So called because Rowan County "had been, at one time, a feud country, and the people were not accustomed to venturing out much after night."[2]

In Wesley's history of the NEA in a chapter entitled "The Guardians of Correct Thinking", he reports the efforts of an elitist group within the NEA structure named The National Council of Education, formed to "reach and disseminate correct thinking on educational questions".[3] While obviously failing in that mission, the Council did, in Wesley's words, spawn "extensive opportunities for speaking and debate within NEA...." Among the "problems crying for solution were the education of freedmen [and] illiteracy"[4]

One topic that today, as always, is a concern of educators employed by the public schools is the curriculum. The curriculum tends to reflect the values held by society as a whole, is fashioned by state authorities, and is influenced in varying degrees by the actions and pressures of thousands of local boards of education ... at one time, tens of thousands.[*] The public now, as always, demands that students be grounded in the basic 3 R's. In addition, it places pressure on school authorities to emphasize certain values or even short-term fads, "Character Education" being an example of the latter.

Wesley attempts to chart the more permanent value judgements of the times by referencing addresses at NEA conventions. He notes that "a complete list of the proposed changes during the hundred years could scarcely be compiled, but the ones that received major attention during the century are easily identified. First in frequency and popularity was the demand for the teaching of citizenship. This word gathered a cluster of associated concepts such as patriotism, loyalty, law observance, democracy, the Constitution, and Americanization."[5] What came in second? Health, Wesley tells us.

---

[*] At the time I was enrolled in a class in School Administration at the University of Denver in 1936 there were over 2,000 local school districts in the state. Many with picturesque names reminiscent of the Old West.

On a different front, in 1920 the NEA established the Legislative Commission. "The Commission sponsored and supported a succession of omnibus bills to provide funds to remove illiteracy, to Americanize the foreign-born ... as well as to establish a department of education with a secretary."[6]

The First Step

This then was the background and intellectual climate of the National Education Association as it approached the second decade of the 20th-century. While by no means a major objective, the need to keep educational opportunity available to all had not been overlooked.

The Addresses and Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting held at Des Moines, Iowa, July 3-8, 1921 reports the following:

The Representative Assembly in session at Des Moines on

> July 8, 1921, on motion of Miss Abby Porter Leland of 60 W. 10th St., New York, NY, unanimously voted to establish a Department of Immigrant Education. Officers will be selected and the Department will hold its first meeting in 1922.[7]

With this action, the NEA took the first step in supporting teacher oriented adult education organizations; a program of encouragement and support that continued over the next half century.

xx

Prologue

REFERENCES

1. Wesley, Edgar B. NEA. The First Hundred Years: The Building of the Teaching Profession. N.Y., Harper and Brothers, 1957. p. 51.
2. Stewart, Cora Wilson. Moonlight Schools for the Emancipation of Adult Illiterates. N.Y., Dutton, 1922. p. 14.
3. Wesley, op. cit., p. 262.
4. Ibid. p. 264.
5. Ibid. p. 117.
6. Ibid. p. 304.
7. NEA Proceedings, 1921. p. 460

Chapter I

NEA: THE SUPER HOLDING COMPANY

In 1857, forty-three teachers and leaders of state teachers organizations responded to a call to convene in Philadelphia for the purpose of founding a new organization. Named the National Teachers' Association, the charter members signed a constitution whose preamble stated that the purpose of the organization was "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States"[1] Although the organization has twice changed its name in nearly a century and a half, other than dropping the word "popular", this incisive, yet comprehensive statement, still serves as the stated purpose of the National Eduction Association.

Since its origin, in addition to developing its own program and steadily advancing in prestige, membership, and influence, the NEA has sheltered and contributed to the support of other educational organizations of more specific and specialized intent. As often as not, the other organizations that became a part of the NEA holdings were associations of school administrators, supervisors, other non-teaching personnel, and teachers in specialized fields.

The 1857 call for a first national meeting of teachers was issued by the presidents of ten state teachers associations. As

NEA historian Edgar B. Wesley tells us, those principally responsible for promoting the meeting were Daniel B. Hagar, president of the Massachusetts State Teachers Association, Thomas W. Valentine, a founder of the N.Y. State Teachers Association, and Zalmon Richards, a man whose career included teaching in a country school, conducting teachers institutes, and eventually founding his own academy in Washington, D.C.

> Thus, a great national organization of the teaching profession was sponsored and inaugurated by humble state associations rather than by the semi-classical American Institute of Instruction, the eminently sponsored American Association for the Advancement of Education, or the lofty Western Literary Institute and College of Teachers. It was not Horace Mann, nor Henry Barnard, nor Francis Wayland nor any other prominent educator who sounded the call and effected a permanent national organization, but ... practical teachers.*
>
> The National Teachers' Association itself became a lofty organization, a kind of super-holding company that coordinated the state associations by providing an annual convention where ideas, theories, and principles

---

*While several of the founders of the Association were elected leaders of state teachers associations, they could scarcely qualify as "practical teachers" in today's use of these words.

> were discussed, leaving the practical application to the local organizations. The annual conventions became marts for the interchange of educational ideas; the annual volume of Proceedings recorded and disseminated the best that was thought and said in American education, common standards emerged from diversity, and in this national forum state leaders became national leaders.[2]

In 1870 the organization adopted a new constitution and was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. The name was changed to the National Educational Association. Also, in 1870, a significant organizational innovation was introduced--one that would remain an important part of NEA structure for nearly a century and further enhance its unique "holding company" characteristic. The innovative concept of sheltering within its structure special interest organizations to be known as "Departments" proved to be particularly helpful to service areas that, because of their specialized character, could not command a large, independent organization of their own.

The first three "outside" organizations to achieve this kind of special relationship with the NEA, together with the dates of their founding, were the American Normal School Association (1858), the National Association of School Superintendents (1865), and the Central College Association (1869). At the 1870 convention, held in Cleveland, Ohio, the NEA established an organization of its own complete with officers and separate bylaws, the Department of Elementary Education.

To quote Wesley again, "The National Teachers' Association emerged from the Cleveland meeting with a new name, the National Educational Association, and an additional function--that of coordinating the associated departments ... by blending the three adopted organizations and the newly created department of elementary education into one great unit".[3] D.H. Hagar, by then the Association's president, said " ... we can preserve the advantages of each [associated organization] and at the same time establish on a broad foundation a broad organization grand in its proportions, and powerful in its operations."[3]

By these actions, the NEA once again dramatically increased its holdings.

In 1907, the name of the association was changed again, this time to its present one, the National Education Association. It was in that year the organization was charted under a special act of Congress; a document thrice amended by the Congress and which remains the foundation of NEA governance. It still retains the ringing words, "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States".

The Panorama of Change

A tradition of supporting change and innovation extends far back in the Association's history, back to the day when it had no staff and no permanent headquarters. Today, as an organization of nearly 2,000,000 teachers, the tradition continues.

Some of the NEA's efforts to introduce new initiatives turned into lost causes. Simplified spelling is one example. The movement to establish a national university is another.[4] At other times the Association helped breathe life into burgeoning movements which involved, at least at the time, relatively few of its members, but represented essential, under-supported services of the public schools. The education of adults is one such example.

When the National Teachers' Association was founded, and for a number of years thereafter, the leadership of the NTA was in the hands of a few prominent men. The annual conventions of the Association were largely devoted to learned presentations in which distinguished individuals exchanged philosophic opinions on the meaning and purposes of education. Women, while frequently oratorically elevated to pedestal status, had no access to the podium until 1866 when they were admitted into membership, considerably before the older professions--medicine, law, and theology--acknowledged the right of women to enter these callings. Once women were granted membership in the NTA, the winds of change became evident. By 1870, the year the name was changed to the National Educational Association, women began serving on the Board of Directors. In 1910 the first woman was elected president.

A further move toward acceptance of the inevitability of new ideas and new concepts took place in 1913 when the Department of Classroom Teachers was organized. As might be expected, this was followed by greatly increased program emphasis on "salary, tenure, pensions, and other welfare matters."[5]

Shortly after World War II a change in the governance of NEA took place that irrevocably placed the balance of power in the hands of widely heterogeneous clusters of individuals elected by state and local educational associations. Prior to 1920, policy decisions were made by those who attended the annual conventions. Frequently these were members living close to the convention site. Those from further away often were those members of a school's administrative staff in a position to secure district funds for the trip. By widening geographical representation, and the election of delegates who met regularly in state caucuses, the Representative Assembly drove policy formation deep within the ranks of diversified state-wide groups of individuals.

If observations made 30 years later can be used as a guide, it can be assumed the Assembly included younger members of the Association; some not too long removed from teacher preparation schools and active in their local associations. It also would have included older, more experienced, and presumably more conservative teachers, principals and superintendents. The Assembly, still today is the Association's supreme governance body. If judged by the resolutions it passes, it remains a forward looking body interested in organizational growth and development as well as in the maintenance of educational values related to the enduring, and to changing, community standards.

As the Association grew, not only did its patterns of governance change, but so did its administrative structure. The first full-time secretary was appointed in 1898. In 1917 the Association moved its headquarters to Washington, D.C. Gradually, headquarter's "Divisions" were established to expedite the work of the Association. In 1945, when the Division of Adult Education Services was established, the number of Divisions then reached a total of 13. Several were strictly administrative units carrying out the functions required to keep track of who and where the members were, pay the bills, and collect the funds due from membership fees and the sale of publications. Service divisions were Publications, Research, Legislation, Federal Relations, and Travel. A Field Division worked with state and local associations. Three of the Divisions were established to support programs too small, or too specialized, to enroll sufficient members to make a major contribution to the support of the organization but too important for the NEA itself not to support. The divisions of Rural Service and Audio-Visual Instructional Service were two of these. The Division of Adult Education Service was the third.

Of the three, the Division of Adult Education Service was destined to develop one of the most controversial and change-oriented programs the Association had yet produced.

A Unique Invention: The Departments

Why did the American Normal School Association, The National Association of Superintendents, and the Central College Association accept the designation "department" rather than "affiliated organization" or some other nomenclature that would identify their independent governance structure? Knowing how today's special interest groups struggle for their own identity, it is difficult to assume the first three voluntary organizations to become departments had any intention of giving up their own autonomy beyond acceptance of the condition that their members become members of the parent organization and that they hold their annual meetings at the same time and place as did the NEA. Such subordinate status as these conditions might appear to impose were more than compensated by the advantages gained.

By meeting at the time of the NEA's annual conference, the Departments were spared the trouble and expense of making convention arrangements on their own. Even in its earliest years, the National Teachers' Association attracted speakers of national importance. Horace Mann spoke at the conference in Cincinnati in 1858. In 1859 President Buchanan hosted a reception for those attending the Washington D.C. meeting. Although none of the speakers at the 1860 meeting were individuals whose names remain at the tip of the tongue of contemporary educators, a notable speech delivered by the Rev.

J.N. Mejilton, Superintendent of Schools in Baltimore, directly attacked the problems of Sectionalism. Wesley paraphrases part of Mejilton's comments as remarking that, "the nation had been remiss in giving no encouragement to education; it should long ago have established a national system of public instruction or a great national school. Citizens do not inherit knowledge of government; it must be taught. Had editors and teachers done their duty, there would now be no sectional crisis."[6] *

For its part, by adopting other organizations as Departments, or spawning similar organizations on its own, the NEA broadened its base of political support by bringing in as allies school administrators and university personnel. By 1869, when the Central College Association became the Department of Higher Education, membership in the parent group, despite four years of war and two years without meetings, had quadrupled from the forty-three present at Philadelphia in 1857 to 170 in 1870.

In today's common parlance the term "department" implies a sub-division of a higher authority; a single unit within a large department store or a part of a university faculty. However, the first definition Webster gives the term is "a distinct sphere: Province." Perhaps that is the concept, one of confederation, on which the leadership of the Normal School Association and the

---

*As a footnote to the history of adult education, at the 1860 convention, those present passed a resolution endorsing evening schools for adults."[8]

other organizations negotiated with the National Teachers' Association when they were granted organizational status within the NTA.

The continued use of the term was not without its problems. At times it generated both pride and embarrassment for the NEA and for an occasional department. At times it resulted in both confusion and recognition in the minds of other educators. It stimulated both loyalty to the NEA as well as lack of organizational responsibility on the part of some members of some departments.

One reason for this was the nomenclature. Even today there are members of contemporary adult education associations who fail to recognize that the NEA Departments of Immigrant and of Adult Education were more than an office in the NEA building staffed by a director and a secretary or two. That these departments had a membership, collected dues, elected officers and boards of directors comes as a surprise to many.

The bylaw requiring membership in NEA was always difficult to enforce. While it is safe to assume that nearly all members of the departments were members of their state and local educational association, many did not become members of NEA. Low salaries was the reason often given for not being able to afford this third membership. In the Departments with which I was associated, many teachers of adults and directors of programs in local school districts were part-time and also had an obligation to pay dues to local and state chapters of other national associations, the American Vocational Association, for example. Some, I am certain, did not become members of NEA simply because they knew there was no penalty attached to not belonging.

The diversity of the departments, and the reality that their program objectives occasionally branched out from those of the NEA, at times confused members of the United States Congress. Although I do not recall the topic at issue, I clearly remember Senator Robert Taft complaining during the presentation of testimony by an officer of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development that this Department's position was different from that presented by the NEA Legislative Commission. In whose advice, he asked, should the Congress place greatest credence?

Growing differences in long range goals and short term strategies among the departments, and between many of them and the NEA, can be attributed largely to the changing character of the field of education. From the end of the Civil War through the beginning of World War I, the overriding concern of those supporting public education was to make schooling universal. It was a time when teacher trainers, superintendents of schools, principals, and classroom teachers were united in a common cause; expanding educational opportunity. The forty years between the two world wars were years of increasing subject matter specialization; health, home economics, art, and social studies;

of pin-pointing new methods of instruction such as the use of audio-visual devices; and developing services to meet the needs and interests of such special populations as retired teachers, school secretaries, handicapped children, and adults seeking remedial or continuing education.

The third period of NEA history, the years following World War II, saw the beginning of a new appreciation of the meaning of democracy. Desegregation of the armed forces was completed in 1948. In 1954 compulsory segregation in public schools was outlawed. Throughout the sixties, one Civil Rights law followed another.

Once the governance pattern changed to a Representative Assembly, the association began the slow, but inevitable, return to the kind of organization that, in name at least, it had started out to be three-quarters of a century earlier--a national teachers association.

In the sixties, collective bargaining began to be advocated as the process by which teacher's salaries and conditions of work should be negotiated. In 1969 the first resolution advocating that local affiliates must negotiate master contracts passed the Representative Assembly. This was followed by a swift increase in services to local associations beginning contract negotiations.

The pending revolutionary impact of the convergence of two forces--the empowerment of teachers and the trend toward collective bargaining--was more felt than experienced during much of the fifties. It was sensed in a growing distance between the NEA's position on many issues and that of some of the departments. As a step in the direction of staving off potential future difficulties, Lyle W. Ashby, one of the members of the staff with the longest tenure, in 1947 was appointed assistant executive secretary for professional relations. Among the many duties assigned to him under the umbrella of this all-inclusive title was that of coordinating the work of the departments. He regularly convened meetings of the department secretaries and conferred with them individually whenever one of them requested an appointment. With consummate skill and infinite patience, he succeeded in holding together for another twenty years an aging fabric that in less capable hands could have been torn to shreds many times.

Chapter I

REFERENCES

1. Wesley, Edgar . NEA: The First Hundred Years: The Building of the Teaching Profession. N.Y., Harper Brothers, 1957. p. 22-23.
2. *Ibid*. p. 24.
3. *Ibid*. p. 44.
4. An entire section of Wesley's history of the NEA (*op*. *cit*.) deals with the topic. "Part IV. Lost Causes," pp. 205-251.
5. *Ibid*. p. 328.
6. *Ibid*. p. 31.

Chapter II

THE DIVISION OF ADULT EDUCATION SERVICE

Between 1920* and 1945, providing educational services for adults had become an increasingly important part of the program of some school districts. This was particularly true in those states where the legislature provided local districts with earmarked funds for adult education and/or technical assistance from the staff of the State Department of Education. "By 1946 seven states ... were providing substantial financial aid for local programs and for state leadership. Moderate progress ..."[1] had been made in seven other states.

Opportunities for in-service education were uneven within the state assisted programs. However, in California and New York, comprehensive programs of teacher training were well established. Gradually, more opportunities for professional development emerged and as of 1956 it could be said that "courses and workshops in adult education offered by summer sessions, extension division, and regular university and college sessions are now abundant...."[2]

Even as state support for adult education grew in widely separated areas of the country, and as steps toward professionalization were being extended, several deeply rooted problems inhibited any universal blossoming of adult education as an integral part of public education. There were school administrators who enthusiastically endorsed adult education at meetings of the school trustees. There were more, however, who interpreted adult education as an intrusion on what they saw not only as the primary, but as the only purpose of public education; the education of children and adolescents. Added to this formidable opposition was, on some occasions, the opposition of teachers who tended to look upon the classroom where they presided during daylight hours as "their" classroom. They resented the intrusion of unknown persons in the room during the evening hours.

---

*In 1920 California established the first Division of Adult Education as a basic part of the educational system within the State Department of Education.

Many school districts that offered programs for adults were reluctant to support them beyond making available the use of school facilities and, usually, the services of a part-time administrator. All instructional and promotional costs in these programs had to be covered by tuition fees. This led to the practice of many adult schools offering only programs that enough members of the community were sufficiently interested in to cover costs. These were predominately vocational and avocational classes with some foreign language classes sprinkled in between. In the absence of support from any other source, local directors were limited in the number of programs they could offer which explored civic and community concerns, areas of study never quite as popular as Floral Design or Beginning Welding. Offerings in the fine arts, other than avocational and literature, were often cancelled before they began for lack of the required minimum number of students.

Of course the opposite was also true, especially in any state where local districts were reimbursed for adult education costs on an Average Daily Attendance Basis.* At times, programs were designed more with an eye to capturing large numbers of participants than for their intrinsic educational value.

There were, of course, exceptions to the "no fee--no class" policy. This was true even in those states without any general state aid for adult education. Classes in elementary education, the offerings of an Evening High School, and the traditional Americanization and Citizenship programs, when offered at all, were usually offered on a no-fee basis.

In the last half of the 1930's, the provision of adult education as a community service received a strong boost from the depression-born Works Progress Administration (WPA) adult education program. While not operated under the direct jurisdiction of local and state school authorities, the educational opportunities it put in place gave employment to many otherwise unemployed school teachers. This introducted more than a million Americans to the benefits of learning for the joy of it and the renewal and/or acquisition of new job skills.

---

*Average Daily Attendance (ADA) is computed by dividing the number of days or hours in attendance by the number of days or hours the school is in session. Thus, the greater the attendance the larger the reimbursement.

Another boost to the education of adults came into play after the Selective Service law went into effect in September 1940. Responsible citizens reacted with shock to the finding that more than 1,000,000 men had to be rejected because they could not read and write sufficiently well to meet military requirements. This marked the beginning of a growing popular sentiment that it was in the national interest that any individual, irrespective of age or reason for dropping out of school, was entitled to complete, at public expenses, at least an elementary school level of education if not, indeed, a secondary school level.

In short, in 1945, the year when the NEA's Division of Adult Education was established, local public schools had a nearly limitless potential for meeting community and below-the-college-level educational needs of adults. As a growing movement, however, it was without a strong national voice to project the vision of the contribution the schools might make to the material and intellectual well-being of the citizens who supported the schools through their payment of taxes. Particularly grievous was the absence of any leadership in articulating standards and the absence of a national strategy designed to influence state legislatures to appropriate the relatively small amounts of additional funds required to support adult education programs at the local level.

The Department of Adult Education of the NEA, established in 1921, in the words of Freeman Butts, the educational historian, "greatly aided"[3] a national fight to lower illiteracy. With few resources and no staff, the Department's efforts were limited to what volunteers could do. The American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) had been established in 1926. While making a permanent contribution to the literature and public acceptance of adult education, its efforts were almost exclusively directed toward supporting the continuing liberal and general education of individuals with an established educational background. As to the United States Office of Education, it did not initiate adult education as one of its significant service functions until 1955. In that year, it created an Adult Education Section. Homer Kempfer, formerly with the Bureau of Adult Education in New York State was named the first director.

The Genesis of the Division

It was natural, therefore, that the National Education Association should be the organization looked to by public school people to respond to this leadership vacuum and assume a position of prominence in strengthening and coordinating the resources of public education in meeting a national educational opportunity.

The catalyst that brought about the eventual decision of the NEA Executive Committee to establish a Division of Adult Education Service was an act of congress; the Servicemens Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the GI Bill of Rights. With more than twelve and a half million men in uniform at the height of the mobilization, administrators in colleges, universities, the public schools, and a myriad of proprietary schools were suddenly faced with the task of planning programs, securing the facilities, and establishing policies ranging from under what circumstances, if any, should former GI's be permitted to enter classes regularly enrolling school-age students to under what conditions, if any, could course credit be granted for time spent in the military.

In reporting to the NEA Executive Committee on February 20, 1945, Howard Dawson, Director of the Division of rural Services, explained the provisions of the GI Bill as they related to education. He pointed out the lack of facilities for returning veterans of the lower school level "and that an exploratory conference to discuss this and kindred problems had been held and that a work conference is being planned for February 26, 27, and 28."[4]

The conference was held as planned and the two organizers, Howard Dawson, director of the Division of Rural Service and Ralph McDonald, executive secretary of the department of Higher Education, reported on the conference to the Executive Committee. The minutes of the April 28 meeting indicate that it was pointed out

> ... that the veterans program is essentially a program of adult education.... Attention was particularly called to the need for making amendments to the so-called GI Bill of Rights ... and the establishment of a National Council on Veterans Education to act as a clearing house of information to provide and conduct research and improvement of education and services for veterans. It was recommended ... that the NEA expanded its services to work in the field of veterans education affairs. This recommendation was later adopted.[5]

The next day, Sunday, April 29, on the recommendation of the NEA's Executive Secretary, Willard Givens, a motion was made, seconded and carried "that there be created a Division of Adult Education Service at NEA headquarters. It was understood that the immediate problem to be attacked by the director of this division is that of veterans' education."[6] On July 6 it is reported that

> ... after considering the qualifications and experience of a number of applicants, a motion was made ... and carried that the recommendation of Secretary Givens for the appointment of Leland P. Bradford as the director of the Division of Adult Education Service be accepted.... Mr. Bradford is serving as the present director of training for the Federal Security Agency in Washington, D.C. Previous to coming to this position, he was with the United States Naturalization and Immigration Service. Before this, for several years, he was in adult education in the state of Illinois.[7]

Thus, in mid-summer 1945, there was more than enough history, and more than enough need, to justify some one agency assuming a posture of national leadership if the lighted schoolhouse was to become a center of community learning below the collegiate level and if there was to be any assurance that the looming problems facing all levels of education as a result of the GI Bill would be approached promptly and decisively.

Staff and Satellite Organizations

Throughout the history of the Division, two of the organizations it spawned, the National Training Laboratories in Group Development (NTL) and the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE) tended to eclipse the existence and the significance of the Division. Yet neither organization could have emerged as quickly, or initially been supported as well, had it not been that the salaries of their staff members and the expense of maintaining their offices came from the funds budgeted by the NEA for the Division of Adult Education Service.

For seventeen of the 27 years the division operated as an NEA headquarters unit, Leland P. Bradford was its director. I was with the Division for 23 years; 12 as assistant director, two as associate director, and nine as director. Although Bradford came to be generally known as director of NTL, and I as executive secretary of NAPSAE, our payroll identification until the time of our retirement (Bradford in 1972, I in 1979) was always that of an employee of an NEA unit. In later years, other individuals were engaged to serve as assistant directors of the Division and both NTL and NAPSAE added additional professional and support staff from earnings and from project grants. Many of these individuals will be identified in the course of this history.

Throughout the lifetime of the Division and its satellite organizations, support staff of high caliber was always at hand. As would be expected, the less responsibility a position entailed, the greater the turn-over. Thanks, however, to the services of the NEA personnel office, a uniformly high quality staff was always assured.

In reality, there was another, largely invisible staff that served not only the Division, but all other units of NEA. A mail room, a personnel office, accounting services, editorial assistance from the Publications Division and the services of a travel office were at the disposal of the Division and utilized to the fullest.

At the center of what was an ever boiling caldron of activity was the Division's first director, Leland P. Bradford. Within a month of his appointment he met with the Board of the Department of Adult Education and was named by its members as executive secretary of the Association and editor of the Adult Education Bulletin, the department's bi-monthly journal. At the same time he was also meeting with Ronald Lippitt and Kenneth Benne about ways of continuing a mutual interest in the kinds of work Lippitt and Bradford has been engaged in at the Federal Security Agency (FSA).

During his tenure as secretary of the Department of Adult Education, Bradford was one of a handful of individuals who successfully engineered the simultaneous demise of the Department of Adult Education and what he saw as a rival, although fading, organization, the American Association for Adult Education. In 1959, with the help of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education, he launched the Adult Education Committee of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession. Although his interest in the Committee would last but a few years, the committee would function effectively under the Division's stewardship for sixteen years. During many of those years it conducted seminars around the world on the responsibility of the public educational authority in all countries for the education of adults.

Two years after he became director of the Division, Bradford was actively engaged with other behavioral scientists in organizing the National Training Laboratory in Group Development, a "nontraditional concept of teaching and learning in the areas of individual, group, and organizational development."[8] In 1952, while far from enthusiastic about the creation of a potential new NEA Department, the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, he did not block its development. In short, Bradford was directly involved, if not in one way--in some other, in all of the institutional creations of the Division.

Any brief summation of Bradford's career at NEA would not do him justice if it failed to acknowledge that during the time he was employed he would seldom be unaccompanied by a swirl of controversy, a circumstance he undoubtedly anticipated with some pleasure and, indeed, helped foster.

At the time of his employment, those directors of state and local programs of adult education identified with public education and who knew him, undoubtedly heralded his appointment and were prepared to welcome him as one of their own. He had been head of WPA Service Projects in Illinois which included, among other programs, adult education, had taught adults and had prepared instructional materials. He had written a Master's Thesis on adult education and for more than two years had been editing the Department of Adult Education's Journal. Although but a small part of his work had been under the direct sponsorship of a state or local school authority, the range of his experience was not too unlike that of many who were. Yet ,as will be developed later, within three years he had lost the support of many of the leaders of state and local programs, including those responsible for veterans education. Few of these individuals felt they were receiving the help from NEA they had anticipated.

Adult Education Background

In his history of NTL, in an autobiographical introduction written by the three principal founders of the organization, Leland Bradford, Kenneth Benne and Ronald Lippitt, Bradford related he received his under-graduate degree from the University of Illinois in 1930. After graduation, with few jobs available, he returned to a former job, feeding punched cards through an IBM sorter in a large mail order house in Chicago. In his words

> ... it wasn't long before I became aware of the cultural starvation of my fellow-employees and I felt it my duty to do something about it. Sitting with one student, I gradually induced a dozen persons to spend three nights a week in what I called the 'Bradford Academy'. I put out some brochures and gave a few free talks to clubs about adult education which I had just discovered. We met on the top floor of a dilapidated building on the Near North Side in Chicago and had difficulty in meeting the small rent because my students had even more difficulty in paying me....
>
> I tried to teach my group Shakespeare and other English literature, English and American history, geology and the rudiments of a psychology course I had taken. They didn't have much time or ability to read college texts, so I would

> digest as much as I could in a few pages which Marty[*] would mimeograph at odd moments in the office where she worked. We managed to keep the class going, with occasional additions for three years.[9]

Bradford returned to the University in 1934 for graduate work and wrote his Master's dissertation on adult education. Again, to quote him on himself, "On the basis of this paper, the dean secured for me a job with the State Education Department to do a survey by travel in Illinois, and around the country by correspondence, of Adult Literacy and Americanization programs, from which I produced two books for the state. This, of course, helped me to be seen as something of an expert on campus in these subjects."[9]

In 1939 he received his Ph.D. in psychology and became a full instructor of Educational Psychology.

> I ... started to teach my class differently from the others in the College of Education. One session each week was held in the regular classroom with my lecturing and assigning readings. The other two sessions were held at night in the basement of a local 'coke and smoke' where we could sit round a table with beer or light drinks,
> discussing my lecture, their readings, and the ways we could

---

[*] Later Mrs. Bradford.

> use our group discussion to help in teaching.... The Administration of the college frowned on taking students away from the campus and I felt embattled, but I persevered.[10]

In 1942 and 1943, as director of the Illinois Works Progress Administration's Service Projects, he saw these programs as an opportunity for experimentation and change. " I fear" he writes "that my relations with many of my colleagues were alienated and embattled as I strove to get them to see that WPA presented a true laboratory for adventuring in education."[11]

Interest in Group Behavior

While at the University of Illinois, Bradford learned about the work of Kurt Lewin, the country's foremost student of the dynamics of group behavior; heard Ronald Lippitt, one of Lewin's students at the University of Iowa, describe the styles of leadership study he was in the process of completing; and began focusing these exposures on the classes he was teaching or in his work with the WPA projects.

Immediately before coming to NEA he had been employed as director of training at the Federal Security Agency, a forerunner of the department of Health, Education and Welfare and, eventually, the Department of Human Services. While at FSA he recounts that

> St. Elizabeth's Hospital (mental) in Washington was also in my area.... One thing of great importance happened to me then and for the future. Either I was there that day, or someone suggested I go because Dr. Moreno* was going to demonstrate his psychodrama. I was totally fascinated and totally impressed. A part of the jigsaw puzzle of training fell in place for me.... I immediately began to use what has come to be called role playing in training foreman and supervisors....[12]

Also, while at FSA, Ronald Lippitt, who had been working at the office of Strategic Services (OSS) visited Bradford.

> He [said] he would like to spend the rest of the year working with me until he went up to the Research Center for Group Dynamics that Kurt Lewin was establishing at MIT. I went immediately to the head of the Federal Security Agency and persuaded him that Ron Lippitt was necessary for our work. We spent much of the late spring and summer working at Freedmens Hospital in Washington, D.C., then the federal hospital for blacks. this was my first introduction to the use of newsprint, and so far as I know, Ron was the first to use it as it has come to be so universally used. At first

---

*J.L. Moreno, Viennese psychiatrist who introduced psychodrama in the 1920's.

> we bought butcher paper and cut it in lengths. Later we went to the newspaper office to get the ends of the news rolls.[12]

The magic markers of the time were crayons.

Employment by NEA

In February of 1945 the NEA-sponsored conference on veterans education was held. Bradford was one of those attending. At that time he met Willard Givens, the NEA Executive Secretary. Bradford reports on the follow-up of that meeting.

> During the spring of 1946 he would invite me to his office about once a week to continue to ask my advice as to which adult educator could best head up the new unit of Adult Education he hoped to establish. I knew I would like the position but assumed that because he was asking my advice about others I was ruled out. I didn't realize that he was testing and evaluating me. In early July ... he called me and offered me the position of Director of the new Division of Adult Education Service, and the Directorship of the new Division of Veterans Education with the NEA.[*] I was happy to accept and was scheduled to start on September 1, 1945.[13]

---

[*] Only one Division was established, the Division of Adult education Service. Facilitating veterans education was part of the mission.

As to whom Bradford might have suggested for the directorship of the Division I can only guess. It is unlikely he was enthusiastic about any of the directors of programs for adults in state departments of education or local districts. As suggested by the disenchantment he expressed about both some of his superiors and his peers at the University of Illinois and during his WPA experience he, generally speaking, had less than a high opinion of educators in the formal school system, most of whom he tended to deem unwilling to experiment with change or think theoretically. When I joined the staff of the Division four years later, one of the problems I soon encountered was the difficulty I experienced in pointing out that some of the tasks involved in meeting the educational needs of adults required individuals who could perform effectively within the limits of standard practice.

While Bradford was deservedly critical of some aspects of public school adult education and frequently referred to it as a cafeteria of hobby courses, he tended to overlook the substantial programs that were available in areas other than the avocational, the difficulties under which many of the programs operated, and the efforts toward professionalization that were taking place.

I thing I can fairly speculate that not all of those once a week coffees in Dr. Givens' office were devoted exclusively to "advice as to which adult educators could best head up the new unit." I can be all but certain he also used the opportunity to convincingly set forth the reasons why he did not find the recent conference on veteran's education "a very good conference, with the time consumed with speeches."[12] He most certainly must have elaborated on the work he was then undertaking with Ronald Lippitt at Freedmens' Hospital in inventing and trying out innovative approaches to supervisory training. He was, as I think later events will substantiate, even then seeking to redefine adult education as applied group dynamics (or whatever other term he might have had in mind), and to establish the newly created Division of Adult Education Service as the principal sponsor.

In the two months that intervened between Bradford's appointment as director of the Division in early July and his beginning the assignment on September 1, Bradford and Lippitt "continued to work primarily at Freedmens' Hospital, and met often at night to talk about what we wanted to do."[13] It is quite evident they did not use those hours together in a discussion of how to exert NEA Leadership in securing needed amendments to the GI Bill or designing methodologies for the executive Committee of the department of Adult Education to consider in developing a fresh vision for the future. As subsequent events would illustrate, neither the question of veterans education nor the involvement of the members of the Department in efforts to strengthen public education as a provider of community based adult education were ever a part of Bradford's agenda. Rather, as he frankly acknowledges, by the summer of 1945, even before beginning his work at NEA, he "knew what I wanted to do and be."[13]

The inevitability of fashioning the new Division as a center for research and training in group behavior was sealed further a few months later when Kenneth Benne was assigned to Washington shortly before his discharge from the Navy. Benne had been a colleague and supporter of Bradford's at the time he was experimenting with a different way of teaching at Urbana. Bradford introduced Benne to Ronald Lippitt and the three got together for lunch. As Benne tells it, "we found much to talk about since Ron had become tremendously interested in training during his work with the OSS and in his work with Lee in the Federal Security Agency, and Lee had been doing training work with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Federal Security Agency."[14]

In Bradford's words, with the long luncheon "our team began to form."[13]

One of the first undertakings of two members of the team was the conference on veterans education held in Cleveland in January 1946 which Bradford and Benne planned. At the time Benne was in the process of beginning his post-war position as a staff member of the Horace Mann Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation at Columbia University, a unit designed to make resources available to public school systems to support school experimentation and to train school people for experimentation they might decide to undertake. The methodology and outcome of the Veterans Conference will be reported in Chapter VII.

Givens on the New Direction

Willard Givens' perception of the direction in which the Division was now moving becomes evident in a comparison of two observations he made about eighteen months apart. In a major address before the NEA Representative Assembly in 1946 entitled "The Challenge", Givens noted:

> Americans take too much for granted. We are aware of the fact that our nation as a whole had the highest standard of living in the world and one of the freest and most liberal education systems. How many of us, however, are aware that there are 10,000,000 adults with so little schooling that they are virtually illiterate; that there are 2,000,000 children aged six to fifteen, not in school; and that 5,000,000 out of 17,000,000 men examined in the draft

> were rejected for educational, mental, and physical deficiencies which might have been largely prevented by good education?[18]

In the December 1947 Adult Education Bulletin, Givens contributed a guest editorial. Using as a title "The Challenge Ahead", one almost identical to the one employed in his earlier address to the NEA Assembly, he began by noting the many burdens wartime dislocation had placed on the American people. He concluded by saying:

> The major problems confronting us today are essentially group problems. Solution of many of the problems therefore, hinges on the degree to which those in the field of adult education can educate adults for group work. The warm, personal, satisfying human relationships that develop when people join together in groups can generate tremendous power. Thru this power adults will move forward to a clarification and solution of their problems.[19]

In other words, it would appear that in the minds of Willard Givens, Lee Bradford, and Bradford's NTL colleagues, the perception of the subject matter of adult education had moved from Americanization, citizenship, literacy education, vocational and avocational education, domestic arts, liberal and civic adult education and other long established contents toward a mastery of the skills of group problem-solving. What many in the field of adult education had long considered an important means was now, and for the next few years, in-so-far as the NEA Division of Adult Education was concerned, would be considered an end in itself.

The Search for Balance

It is unlikely there were any shouts of joy when it was announced that Robert A. Luke of Cincinnati, Ohio, as of March 7, 1949, was joining the staff of NEA's Division of Adult Education Service as assistant director. To begin with, there was little advance notice that this event would take place. Even if the Adult Education Bulletin, the Department's journal, had trumpeted the news on its front cover, it is more than possible it would have elicited more cries of disapproval than of approval. Such a reaction would have been particularly evident on the part of those members of the Department who were also members of the NEA; that segment of the Association's membership committed to strengthening the contribution of public education to adult education. I carried no credentials that would suggest I was the one to hoist this banner even though my pre-employment understanding was that public education was the area in which I was expected to work.

It would be several years before I came to a clear realization that the individuals I would primarily be called upon to serve were personnel on the staffs of state departments of education and the adult education leadership of local school districts. This realization was gained not as a result of pressure from my superiors at NEA, but as a result of a growing exposure to the work being done by the membership of the Department of Adult Education. Also contributing to this understanding, as will be discussed in a later chapter, was a personal concern over an aborted study of adult education by the Educational Policies Commission, a prestigious panel of scholars and practitioners sponsored jointly by the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators.

My professional training had been that of a librarian. Like others in the rapidly developing cadre of adult education leadership, I had had experience as a state director of a WPA project. However, while Leland Bradford in Illinois, Arthur Crabtree in Indiana, and Cyril Houle in Florida had been directors of state-wide adult education projects (in Bradford's case the supervision of the program area in which adult education was placed), I had been director of Colorado's WPA library project.

Before coming to Washington to work for the NEA I had been employed as assistant director of the Chicago Adult Education

Council, director of a privately-funded adult education program offered by the Springfield, Illinois public library, and executive secretary of the Cincinnati Adult education Council.

At Springfield I gained experience in planning an adult education program, organizing classes, and employing instructors. I was, however, never under pressure to persuade a local superintendent of schools, or, through him, members of a Board of Education to see the importance of making public funds available for the support of an educational program designed for adults.

In Cincinnati, my principal task was, to the extent such an assignment is ever possible, to "coordinate" the adult education program of many different agencies. A less complex task was to promote the concept of adult education throughout the city. I knew well, and was on excellent terms with, the director of the Cincinnati Public school's program, but no more so that with the education chairperson of the Cincinnati Womens' Club, the educational director of the YMCA, the president of a Jesuit college with a vigorous adult education program, the dean of continuing education at the University of Cincinnati, the executive director of the B'Nai B'rith Vocational Guidance Center and many other leaders of public and private groups offering programs for adults.

If I had been asked to name a specialty within the field I would probably have said "community organization." I had served for several years as the regional vice-president of the Department of Adult Education but my ideological loyalties were closer to those of the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE), an all-inclusive membership organization not known for being particularly impressed with the adult education efforts of state and local school systems. At the national conference of the five national organizations held in Detroit in 1946, I attended the business meeting conducted by the Department but felt most at home with individuals representing the AAAE and the delegation from the American Library Association.

Although I had met Bradford earlier, I came to know him best when he visited Cincinnati in the spring of 1948 to give a demonstration of role-playing as an adult education method at the annual meeting of the Council's membership. At some point during his stay in the city he told me in considerable detail, and with great enthusiasm, about the first session of NTL that had been held in Bethel, Maine the previous summer. I was intensely interested and recognized it at once as the kind of learning experience that would be of immense value as I endeavored to find ways of increasing the involvement and participation of the members of the council in the organization's work. Out of this conversation grew an invitation to join the staff of the Division and to visit Bethel for one week during the forthcoming summer session.

Upon reporting to work in March of 1949, I discovered my first major responsibility was to edit the Adult Education Bulletin. Bradford retained the title of editor but gladly gave to me, in my dual role of assistant director of the Division and associated secretary of the Department, all but unlimited authority to turn out the magazine. This was a low risk delegation on Bradford's part. He had accumulated a back-log of manuscripts he was eager to see published and, since the NEA publications division assumed responsibility for technical editing, art work, and production, my editorial responsibilities were limited. Because of the opportunity to work with two sympathetic and conscientious members of the NEA publication's staff, serving as associate editor helped me develop still another skill that stood in good stead throughout my professional career.

The second major task I was assigned in my role as assistant secretary of the Department was working with the recorders at the Department's 1949 conference and being responsible for compiling the conference report. A rereading of that report clearly indicated that after six months on the job I had little interest in the substance of adult education and was almost exclusively preoccupied with the process of conference planning. The first sentence of the report read, "the 1949 Conference of the department ... was the sixth activity in a continuing endeavor to develop conference patterns adapted to professional problem-solving in adult education."[19] The last sentence of my introduction indicates I had done my best to keep uppermost an emphasis on conference methodology. I wrote that the report of the 1949 conference, along with those of earlier conferences, was "the beginning of a body of literature that will provide limited source material on the problems and responsibilities of planning conferences for all professional adult educators."[20]

In between these sentences I reviewed the methodological break-through of the earlier conferences conducted under Bradford's leadership. Basing my own conclusions almost entirely on innovations in conference design and purpose introduced the year before at the 1948 conference which I had attended, I gave the meeting high marks. In later years Bradford acknowledged that the 1948 Conference held at Purdue University was a "somewhat disastrous" experience.[21] (See Chapter VII). I can now also identify it as a further step in the strategy, first undertaken in the early forties, to nudge the Department away from its historic mission of supporting adult education as a service of the public schools and to install the methodology of working with groups as a major program emphasis. By announcing the conference as "A National Conference on Adult Education" it also served to strengthen the appeal of the Department to members of the AAAE.

By the end of 1949 I had attended two national conferences of the Department. Even so, I was so isolated from the Department's membership that I was either unable, or unwilling, to recognize that while the conference met the objectives of those who were experimenting with work conference design, they failed completely to meet the objective of those to whom the conference belonged--the Department's core membership.

The reason for the isolation was, of course, my preoccupation in what, at the time, was the central program objective of the Division; promoting and expanding activities related to the further development of NTL. My preoccupation was well rewarded. Each June my family and I left for what would be, at a minimum, a two month's sojourn in the beautiful town of Bethel, Maine. The working hours were long and there were some official duties to be attended to every day of the week, but the benefits were large. In addition to working, and being assigned a faculty residence on the grounds of Gould Academy, not only I, but all members of my family, developed important friendships with many members of the NTL staff; the thirty or more social scientists brought together each summer from some of the most prestigious universities in the country. Most of all, my understanding of why individuals in a group relate to each other in the ways that they do--or do not relate--increased in both depth and scope. What I learned there I endeavored to put into practice throughout my career.

What I had not done during those first years at NEA was to prepare myself for the other part of the division's work, the part that was the inescapable responsibility of the NEA to provide. It had not occurred to me after my arrival in Washington to take an orientation tour to visit the magnificent adult education programs in such states as California, New York or Florida. Although the president of the department of Adult Education at that time was the director of adult education for the Baltimore Public Schools and a frequent visitor to the NEA, his conversations with Bradford and me almost invariably went back to the first session of NTL he had attended or the need to induct all adult educators into a deeper understanding of the way groups work. Worse yet, I failed to take it upon myself to come to know and meet the the staff member of the on-going, relatively near programs in New York city, Philadelphia, many communities in New Jersey, or even Washington, D.C.

It would be at least another year and a half before I recognized that the activities of the Division must, if not be redirected, at least strike a balance between providing training in developing sensitivity to the phenomenon of group experience and seeking to help local districts meet current problems in adult education. Leaders in public school adult education were beginning to voice demands that the NEA provide leadership in assisting state and local school districts raise the salaries of part-time teachers in adult programs, that it encourage the Congress to acknowledge the federal role in lowering the level of adult literacy, and that it direct more attention to the continuing difficulties encountered by those school systems providing educational opportunities for veterans.

Seeking Balance

By 1951 some, but not all, of these previously unattended interests of individuals conducting programs for adults in public schools gradually began to receive greater NEA support. The immediate effect, however, was that until 1962, when NTL was separated from the Division of Adult Education, the NEA was supporting, through its adult education division, two quite different enterprises. One was, in effect, a summer adult education program and attendant year-long consultation service based on a growing body of research for which NTL was largely responsible. The NTL "students" were drawn predominately from the leadership of large public and private, profit and non-profit, organizations seeking to improve and upgrade management and stimulate community and organizational development. The other program, that of the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, represented a return to the established role of the NEA in maintaining a service agency for adult education practitioners in the public schools.

Whether or not it was a wise course of action on the part of NEA governance to permit programs to develop as unit managers themselves might wish, can be debated both ways. Evidence that it was a wise policy can be found today in the knowledge that both strands of the two-pronged program are firmly institutionalized. Each one has had an enduring impact on educational practice. The National Training Laboratory in Group Development, now called the NTL Institute, continues to provide through-out the year seminars, workshops, and laboratory-like training experience for those seeking further training in management practices and organizational development. The legacy of NAPSAE's efforts in support of state and local educational programs for adults is the biennial reenactment of the Adult Education Act. This provides continuing federal aid for adult academic education below the collegiate level in all states, in many schools and junior colleges, and in a variety of voluntary agencies.

On the other hand, the proposition can be supported that the decade spent at various times by some or all of the Division staff in promoting an understanding of group process as a focal point of adult education, substantially interrupted the systemic development of the adult education movement. Further, successful as the Laboratories were, it is possible there might have been a more immediate integration of the concepts of NTL into the broad practice of education had they been nurtured within the walls of a research and development center rather than within a professional organization seen by its members to e charged with a different agenda.

Such speculation could quickly be dismissed as "idle" were it not that some NTL leaders at one time or another questioned the wisdom of remaining a part of NEA. (See chapter 11). while the NEA was far less of a "conservative organization"[22] than Bradford cared to acknowledge, still a considerable gap did exist between its basic pedagogical position and Bradford's characterization of NTL as a "non-traditional concept of teaching and learning."[23]

Two conclusions, however, seen certain. One is that it is improbable that any one with less skill than Bradford in advancing new concepts could have bridged the chasm so successfully. The second conclusion is that it is difficult to conjure up the name of any organization, other than NEA, where such diverse programs as NAPSAE and NTL could spring forth from within the same subunit. It may be that the reason the governance and management of NEA took the varied activities of the Division so well in stride was that, for them, it was but a continuation of the Association's long tradition of supporting causes that might become lost--or that equally well might become winners.

Chapter II

References

1. Mann, George C. "The Development of Public School Adult Education." Chapter I, Public School Adult Education: A Guide for Administrators and Teachers. (Edited by Manfred E. Evans.) Washington, D.C.: National Association of Public School Adult Educators, 1956, p.4.

2. *Ibid*. p. 8.

3. Butts, R. Freeman, "Illiteracy." World Book Encyclopedia. Chicago, Field Enterprises, 1968. Vol. 10, p. 64.

4. NEA Proceedings, 1945-46, p. 288.

5. *Ibid*. p. 290.

6. *Ibid*. p. 292.

7. *Ibid*. p. 302.

8. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History: 1947-1970. Bethel, Me, 1974. p. 1.

9. *Ibid*. p. 23.

10. *Ibid*. p. 24.

11. *Ibid*. p. 25.

12. *Ibid*. p. 26.

13. *Ibid*. p. 27.

14. *Ibid*. p. 16.

15. *Ibid*. p. 32.

16. *Ibid*. p. 31.

17. NEA Proceedings, 1946- 47, p. 30.

18. Givens, Willard E. "The Challenge Ahead." Adult Education Bulletin 12: 35-36, December 1947.

19. NEA Department of Adult Education. Conference Report, 1949. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1950, p.v.

20. *Ibid*. p. *viii*.

21. Bradford, Leland P. *op. cit*., p. 57.

22. *Ibid*. p. 127.

23. *Ibid*. p. 2.

Chapter III

THE DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

The direct role of the Carnegie Corporation in the founding of the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) is well known. Not so well known is the indirect influence a Carnegie supported study had on the founding of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education.

In 1918 the Carnegie Corporation began work on a 10-volume Americanization Study. In 1920 the study's Division of Schooling issued a one-volume report entitled Schooling of the Immigrant.[1] This detailed report surveyed the accomplishments of educational programs for immigrants and, in large part, found they did not measure up to the need--or to the public clamor--to "Americanize" the immigrant. While the author reports gradual progress toward a more adequate legislative authorization for adult classes and evening schools, he found little of it backed up by adequate financing. To the extent reliable statistics were available, he found that the reason for limited attendance on the part of adults and a high drop-out rate did not reflect dissatisfaction with the instruction received as much as it did with the demands of the work place on the students.

The chapter on "Schooling in Citizenship" was written by Raymond Moley, chairman of the Americanization Committee in

Cleveland and, after the Department of Immigrant Education was founded, one of its more active members. The editor, and author of most of the chapters, was Frank V. Thompson, superintendent of schools in Boston. As assistant superintendent, Thompson had been supervisor of immigrant education for the Boston schools.

Carnegie's interest in the problems and processes of Americanization came at a time when there was a growing unease on the part of many Americans that once an armistice was signed, the temporary interruption of European migration brought about by the war would resume and be augmented by mass in-migration from Mexico and French-speaking Canada.

American industry was warning that it no longer had need for unskilled immigrant workers. At the same time, American labor was protesting that a continuation of existing immigration policies would endanger present jobs. Many of those not anticipating the arrival of friends and relatives from abroad feared that a new wave of immigration would bring in Bolsheviks and other radicals. Congress was preparing to enact legislation that would reverse the traditional policy of unrestricted immigration.

It was this same climate of change and uncertainty that prompted the NEA, concerned about the impact of unsettled times on children, to authorize at its 1918 convention in Pittsburgh the creation of a Commission on the Revision of Elementary Education. The secretary of the Commission was Elizabeth A. Woodward, Supervisor of work with immigrant women in the New York State Education Department.

Ms. Woodward, later to become active in the founding of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education, made certain that "in the discussion on the extent of the Commission's work, Elementary Education was understood to include elementary instruction of adults as well as of children."[2] The chair of the committee, Margaret McNaught, and two members of the Commission, Olive M. Jones, Principal of P.S. 120 in New York City and Payson Smith, Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, strongly supported her. The result was the creation by the Commission of a special committee on Instruction of Immigrants with Ms. Woodward as chair.

It was recognized by members of the Commission that although "adult psychology applied not only to methods of approach but to classroom procedures, and subject matter differed greatly from that employed in work with children ... [that] since the general administration practice had been to place day and evening immigrant classes under elementary school supervision ... this ever growing field of extension education"[2] fell within the scope of the Commission's work. Before taking any steps in the investigation of adult education practices in the education of adult immigrants, Ms. Woodward consulted with specialists in the Carnegie Americanization Study. From them she learned that the collection of statistics in the Carnegie study ended in November 1918. "The NEA committee therefore decided to begin its investigation where the Americanization Study ended"[2] and "not to repeat developments where they have already been fully written up."[3] Most of the data collection was done by questionnaire and the staff of the Carnegie study assisted in the identification of sites to be queried.

Within the same time period, individuals in state departments of education and individual school districts with a responsibility for immigrant education organized a networking system called the Interstate Council on Immigrant Education. Members began meeting in February during the meetings of the Department of Superintendence (later to be known as the American Association of School Administrators) and again in the summer at the NEA Convention held in various locations around the United States. By the time the Council was ready to issue its first publication the Department of Immigrant Education had come into being. Its publication bore the principal title Interstate Bulletin. A long sub-title indicated that its coverage included adult elementary education, English and citizenship for the foreign born, and reading and writing for the native born.

Literacy Education

As indicated by the masthead of the Interstate Bulletin, the plight of the native born illiterate was also of concern to the founders of the Department of Immigrant Education even though initial leadership was composed largely of personnel directly involved in the broader educational implication of immigrant education.[*]

Throughout NEA's history there had been hand-ringing over the plight of the illiterates, frequently on behalf of the blacks who had been freed from slavery following the Civil War. Seventy years would pass, however before the Association made provision within its structure for a systematic approach to confronting the enormity of the problems generated by adult illiteracy. In 1918, an NEA Illiteracy Commission was appointed with Cora Wilson Stewart as its chair. Its function, according to Mrs. Stewart, was similar to that of the Illiteracy Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, of which she was also chair, and the Literacy Commission of the Womens Christian Temperance Union. Her description of all three was that their purpose was largely "propaganda and the stimulation of activity in the field of education of adult illiterates."[4]

---

[*] In addition to teaching English to the foreign born, Immigrant Education embraced instruction about American life and customs and preparation for naturalization examinations. A significant part of many programs was directed toward trying to reach families in which the woman was frequently cut out of the social life to which the husband, through his work, and the children, through their schools, were exposed. Other objectives were to smooth the way toward utilization of existing health services, provide information about the wide range of diet made possible by the variety of produce available in the new country, and supplying information about government actions effecting aliens. The well-run immigrant education program was a first step toward the Community School of later date.

In 1920, the NEA Department of Rural Education joined the discussion by addressing the problem of illiteracy in rural areas. The presentation was made by Elizabeth Kelly, rural director for North Carolina.[5]

In 1921, the National Council on Education, an NEA advisory group, possibly as a result of some prodding on Mrs. Stewart's part, appointed its own Committee on Adult Illiteracy. Mrs. Stewart also became chair of that committee. She saw this body as having a quite different agenda than that of the other groups she had chaired. It was her dream that the Council's committee would address the technical problems encountered by those actively engaged in literacy education. However, instead of appointing a group of literacy experts to the Committee, the president of the Council on Education loaded it with seven state superintendents of education, one former state superintendent, two newspaper editors, and two adult education practitioners. In addition to Mrs. Stewart, the other equally well-known specialists was Wil Lou Gray, the supervisor of adult schools in South Carolina.

That she was disappointed in the make-up of the committee is clear from her first report to the Council. After making the obligatory statement that whatever she had to say "should not be construed to mean that there is dissatisfaction with the Committee or criticism with any of its members" she quickly came to the point. It was her hope, she said, "that possibly some of this Committee who represent the general field of education, may be exchanged with the Illiteracy Commission of the National Education Association giving us the benefit of the experts on that Commission.... A small committee of such experts, if only five or six, would be of more service than dozens gathered from the field of education at large"[5]

There can be no doubt that Mrs. Stewart had ambitious plans for the Council's committee. She saw its function as giving aid in "standardizing plans, methods, and institutions; ... to investigate and report on laws pertaining to illiterate adults; ... to fix the standards of literacy; and to announce accurate statistics." In addition she would have the committee "sort and sift the good from the bad in plans, methods, tactics, phraseology, slogans, and all that pertains to literacy campaigns...."[6]

Despite the enthusiasm, the energy, and the commitment of Mrs. Stewart to the cause of literacy education, it was not to be the direct fruits of her leadership that would eventually lead to the founding of the NEA Department of Immigrant Education and soon thereafter the Department of Adult Education. Rather, these organizations were to grow out of the NEA's Literacy Commission and Mrs. Woodward's special committee on Instruction of Immigrants.

Leaving aside the question of personality differences which may, or may not, have been written into this page of history, the reasons for the ideological endurance of the NEA Commission and, in terms of NEA history, the gradual evaporation of the Council's committee, are not difficult to deduce.

By starting first, the NEA Commission had already co-opted the "experts" Mrs. Stewart so dearly wished were a part of the Council's Committee. These individuals with hands-on experience in literacy education were to be found largely on the staffs of state departments of education and local school districts. Personnel employed by these agencies reflected the predominate clientele of the NEA and were, therefore, natural candidates for appointment to its Literacy Commission. Also, although Mrs. Stewart, a county superintendent of schools, certainly could lay claim to being a member of the educational establishment, she did not share the view of members of the NEA Commission that the irradiation of illiteracy was a preeminent responsibility of public education. Foremost on the agenda of members of the NEA Commission was the pursuit of funds for state leadership and of specifically designated funds for literacy education in local districts. Stewart was firmly committed to the concept of volunteerism.

In 1913 in a letter to Kentucky's Governor McCready, Mrs. Stewart had urged the establishment of an official Illiteracy Commission. As she saw it, the first purpose of the Commission would be "to promote voluntary effort on the part of teachers and others and to cooperate with those who are already making an effort." Her confidence in the effectiveness of this approach was so great that she went on to add, "what had been done in Rowan county [Ky.] in three years in reducing and almost wiping out her illiteracy, can be done in Kentucky during the next six years--by the time the Federal Census is taken."[7]

The Kentucky Illiteracy Commission was appointed and Mrs. Stewart was named its chair. The presidents of two state Normal Schools and one other county superintendent completed the roster. The state, however, had not appropriated as much as a dollar to finance the Commission's work. Much of its effort, therefore, was expended in raising funds to carry on a campaign urging, as stated in a Gubernatorial Proclamation later that year, "every public and private school teacher, every professor in our high schools, colleges, and universities [to] help in the great work of teaching adult illiterates, both male and female, to read and write and spell...."[8] *

To point out that despite these lofty aspirations, the number of illiterates in Kentucky according to the 1920 Census was 2,416,630, in no way takes away from an inspiring accomplishment. In 1914 she introduced the mountain people of Eastern Kentucky to the slogan "Each One Teach One;"[9] words taken very seriously by those whom she was able to reach with her message and words that would be echoed a few years later half a world away as Frank Laubach began his literacy crusade in the Philippines.

For years, strongly felt convictions about the efficacy of the volunteer tutorial programs _vs_. organized classroom instruction have been expressed by the advocates of each. Today, the dimensions of the problem have brought citizens, public officials, and educators at all levels to recognize that if the "thousand points of light", the call for volunteers on the part of President Bush, plus present federal, state, and local

---

*In 1916 Kentucky appropriated $5,000 annually for two years for the benefit of the Illiteracy Commission.[10]

appropriations for literacy education, could all be multiplied a hundred times, the country would still face problems of illiteracy as staggering as those the literacy pioneers were prepared to face earlier in our history.

The Department of Immigrant Education

The first president of the Department of Immigrant Education was William C. Smith, Supervisor of Immigrant Education in New York State. Although officially created in 1921, the first meeting of the Department was held in Boston, July 3-6, 1922. Those in attendance were prepared to get down to work immediately. There is no record of any self-congratulatory speeches or greetings from various dignitaries. Before noon the participants had heard three speeches, all long by today's standards, especially so when, according to the proceedings,[11] they were followed after lunch by three more addresses and a panel presentation. There was no provision for discussion until the end of the afternoon session.

Leading off the opening session was Owen A. Hoban, Special Justice of the Court in Massachusetts. Not only did he deliver a witty address that still makes interesting reading, but he came from a community that had had a publicly supported adult education program since 1900, and from a state that first began to appropriate funds for evening schools in 1823. Justice Hoban described the successful efforts to attract both native born and foreign born illiterates. As he told it:

> We started in 1900 with the evening schools. With the large alien population up there, all the people we could get interested in the idea of learning the English language were one hundred and some of them were not even aliens, but Americans who wanted a little improvement. So we dribbled and drooled along ... until the assistant principal of the high school took charge. He found the night school was not getting things done the right way. The night school record under [Ralph] Fritz went from 303 to 557--just by showing a little interest in the alien.[12]

The second address was on "Socialization of the Immigrant: Method, Content, and Procedure" by the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Immigration for the California State Department of Education. The first morning came to a close with an address by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools in Amsterdam, N.Y., who spoke on "How to Solve the Problem of Immigrant Mothers." And so it went for three days. Speeches and panel discussions which did more than identify problems but provided specific details on how the problems had been met in local communities. Although a majority of the presentations were made by officials of state and local education systems, two teachers, two immigrant pupils, and two foreman responsible for recruiting students to the "factory classes", all had their say. Before the meeting was over, more than 20 individuals had formally presented their views including one who pressed for the certification of teachers of adults.

Thus, several precedents were set that would distinguish NEA sponsored adult education membership organizations for years to come. First, the development of a primary audience of directors and supervisors from state and local school systems augmented by a sprinkling of classroom teachers. Second, an emphasis on the practical, "how-to-do" aspects of administration and instruction. In a sense, a third precedent was also set. By printing the full text of all addresses (63 pages of compact type) in the NEA 1922 Proceedings, the practical content of the meeting was transmitted to a much wider audience by means of a readily available publication.

Considerable satisfaction must have been generated by this first meeting since plans were made to meet again in six months in Chicago in conjunction with the convention of the Department of Superintendence. At that meeting, in addition to the usual speeches (one by the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration) a committee to draft a constitution was appointed, dues were set at $1.00, a resolution opposing the registration of aliens was presented, and a nominating committee appointed. When the resolution on the registration of aliens was brought before the members it was rejected and a committee appointed to "study the proposed plan ... and to report upon it at the Oakland meeting."[13]

The second annual meeting was convened in San Francisco July 3-5, 1923. The text of the draft constitution was "adopted as read,"[14] The committee reporting on the registration of aliens (the Johnson Bill),* voiced strong disapproval. The committee expressed its opinion "that one cannot compel good American citizenship. If anything must be compulsory it should be the furnishing of proper educational facilities...."[15] The members present accepted the report and then went on to adopt a Resolution which read in part "that any method of compulsory registration adopted in the United States of America should apply equally to native and foreign-born residents and that no penalty be imposed upon one group that is not imposed upon the other."[15] While the record does not indicate what political action the department might have taken to support its view, the interest shown in this piece of pending legislation is one more indication of the shape of things to come. Usually in close cooperation with the NEA Legislative Commission, established in 1920, the Department of Immigrant Education and its successors, the Department of Adult Education and the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, all became active in supporting, opposing, or proposing legislative action at the federal level.

---

*Introduced on March 11, 1922 by Rep. Albert Johnson of Washington. Its purpose was to establish a method for the registration of aliens "for their better guidance and protection."[15] The bill was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. No hearings were held.

The third annual meeting of the Department of Immigration was held in Washington D.C. July 1-3, 1924. At the business meeting, held at the end of the first day's session, a resolution was introduced recommending "that the name of the Department of Immigrant Education be changed to Department of Adult Education.* It is understood that the functions of the new department shall include the activities in the field of education for those native and foreign born adults who need instruction in the fundamental elementary subjects."[17] In keeping with its vision of a broader function the 125 members present (only 75 less than attended the Founding Assembly of the Adult Education Association of the USA in 1971) also resolved "That the National Education Association endorse the appointment of a specialist in adult education in the Federal Bureau of Education, or in the Department of Education when organized."

---

*In Ten Years of Adult Education, Morse Cartwright asserts that "before the month of June 1924, the term 'adult education' was not in use in the United States of America."[18] He attributes its first use to the convening by the Carnegie Corporation on June 18th of that month of the first of its many conferences on the subject prior to the formation of the AAAE in 1926. Since two national bodies began officially using the term within two weeks of each other either there was some overlap in membership at the two meetings or, more likely, the words had already been in use for some time by practioners in referring to their work.

On July 3, 1924, two days after the change of name had been approved, "W.C. Smith for the Resolutions Committee, announced the approval of the National Education Association of the change of name of the department to Department of Adult Education."[19]

Chapter III

REFERENCES

1. Thomson, Frank Victor. *Schooling of the Immigrant*. N.Y.: Harper and Brothers, 1921. 417 p. Republished in 1971: Montclair, N.J: Patterson Smith. (Patterson Smith Reprint Series in Criminology, Law Enforcement, and Social Problems).

2. Woodward, Elizabeth A. *Report on Elementary Education of Non-English Speaking Adults.* *Survey and Tendencies of Work. 1919-1921*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, [1921]. p. 7.

3. *Ibid* p. 8.

4. *NEA Proceedings*, 1922. p. 454.

5. *Ibid*. p. 453.

6. *Ibid*. p. 454.

7. Stewart, Cora Wilson. *Moonlight Schools for the Emancipation of Adult Illiterates*. N.Y., Dutton, 1922. p. 58-59.

8. *Ibid*. p. 67.

9. *Ibid*. p. 48.

10. Thompson, *op. cit*., p. 315.

11. *NEA Proceedings*. 1922. pp. 905-968.

12. *Ibid*. p. 909-910.

13. *NEA Proceedings*, 1923. pp. 904-968.

14. *Ibid*. p. 674.

15. *Ibid*. p. 675.

16. U.S. 67th congress, 2nd Session. H.R. 18060: *"A Bill to Establish a Method for the Registration of Aliens*. Washington, D.C.: House Committee on Immigration and

Naturalization. Congressional Record. Vol. 62, pt. 4. p. 3773.

17. NEA Proceedings, 1924. p. 566.

18. Cartwright, Morse A. Ten Years of Adult Education. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1935. p. 3

19. NEA Proceedings, 1924. p. 567.

Chapter IV

THE DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION:

YEARS OF TRANQUILITY

The original constitution of the Department of Adult Education differed from that of the Department of Immigrant Education only in a widening of the "objects" article. Dues remained at one dollar per year, membership was open only to members of the NEA, and the president of the Department was still instructed to develop the year's program in consultation with the president of the NEA and "arranged to conform with his ideas."[1]

The purposes of the organization were considerably enlarged by substituting the word "people" for immigrants in such phrases as "promote the establishment of classes and schools wherein all people above the compulsory school age may learn to speak, read and write the English language and ... become intelligent, loyal and law-abiding citizens." It aspired to "most expeditiously and most thoroughly instruct all adults in the fundamentals of education, such as the reading, writing and speaking of English, geography, history and civics and bring about unity of feeling and ideals among all the people of the United States, both native and foreign born."[2] These words replaced the more limited aspiration of members of the Department of Immigrant Education to "expeditiously and thoroughly Americanize the immigrants."[3]

The new bylaws also pledged the Department to urge the appointment of state directors of adult education in all of the states. This replaced the "object" of urging the appointment of directors of immigrant education.

The first meeting of the new Department was held in Indianapolis, June 29 and 30, 1925. Charles M. Herlihy, state supervisor of Adult Alien Education in the Massachusetts State Department of Education was elected president. The membership totaled 240.

In his opening address, Mr. Herlihy acknowledged that the schools alone could not do the job the members had set out for themselves. He sadly observed that "five minutes after leaving the classroom the pupils may see some citizens violating the ideals taught." However, he went on to say that "our problem is great, but our ideals are sound and the schools are able to shoulder the responsibility."[4] Wil Lou Gray, supervisor of Adult Schools in South Carolina, gave a step-by-step account on how to organize a program for adults in a county, city or town.

At the business meeting on Tuesday afternoon, June 30, the members adopted a resolution that, with an occasional modification, can be thought of as a manifesto to guide and motivate adult education workers in public education for as long at the United States struggles to play catch-up in the battle to reduce illiteracy:

> Whereas, It had been repeatedly stated by competent persons in the Department that the importance of elementary education does not vary with the age of the student, that the opportunity for education is the right of each and every person, regardless of age, creed, race or place of birth; that the opportunity for education should not be limited to any special time of the day or year, and that the offering of the opportunity for adult elementary education is the responsibility of the public schools of this nation;
>
> Be it Therefore Resolved, That this Department commits itself to the proposition, that education for adults who voluntarily seek it should be an organic part of free universal education, should be offered by the public schools, at such time and in such places as meet the needs and convenience of the students.... That all administrative officers, supervisors, and teachers in elementary education for adults must maintain the high professional standard and the scientific methods of research which have been established by the teaching profession of the nation.[8]

Substitute the words "adult secondary education, or equivalent" for adult elementary education ("Adult Basic Education" in contemporary terminology), expand the definition of public schools to include community colleges and, with few modifications, the resolution could be adopted today by the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE) and by state and provincial associations as a guiding principle governing public responsibility for the basic education of adults.

The Pioneers

Lofty as these goals were, they were by no means drawn from the thin air of untested idealism. They grew out of a history, limited though it was, of hard-won achievement.

In 1915, in Denver Colorado, Emily Griffith told a reporter for the Denver Post:

> I wonder if you will let me tell you of a hope I have for the people in and out of my school[*]--the boys and girls, their parents too, whose education has been limited. I want to help establish a school where the clock will be stopped from morning till midnight. I want the age limit for admission lifted and classes so organized that a boy or girl working in a bakery, store, laundry, or any kind of shop, who has an hour or two to spare, may come to school, study what he or she wants to learn to make a life more useful. The same rule goes for older folks too. I know I will be

---

[*] She was then an elementary school teacher.

> laughed at, but what of it? I already have a name for that school. It is Opportunity.[6]

The obstacles to be overcome were great indeed. In her book The Golden Opportunity, Elinor Bluemel tells the story:

> Colorado Law School had no provision for the education of adults in the daytime. The idea was revolutionary in that it would provide for the education of children and adults in the same school. Emily Griffith did not agree. 'School age is an exploded notion,' she insisted.... Finally, at the meeting of the Board of Education, May 11, 1916 the Superintendent of the Denver Schools recommended 'that the old Longfellow School be thoroughly repaired and that adequate light be furnished ... and the building be equipped as the 'Opportunity School' which shall be opened both as a day and an evening school, and that Miss Emily Griffith be appointed principal at a salary of $1800.00 per year, this salary to include both day and evening service. It is further recommended that the school be open for part time as early in the summer as possible....' The resolution passed unanimously.[7]

The Emily Griffith Opportunity School of Denver, so named after Ms. Griffith's retirement in 1933, today is housed in a four story building occupying a full city block. It continues to be supported in large measure from school district funds by citizens who accept its presence as a standard part of the school budget.

Another pioneer in the effort to secure public support for the education of adults was Wil Lou Gray in South Carolina. After attracting state-wide recognition because of her ability to organize evening schools in Lauren County for both the under-educated and the well-educated, she first became field secretary for the South Carolina Illiteracy Commission and then state supervisor of adult schools.

In a country where the idea of a residential school for adults has never caught on, in 1921 she successfully organized the South Carolina Opportunity School. Although named after the Opportunity School in Denver, it was a residential school, operated only for a month in the summer, and was designed to provide an educational opportunity in an environment that was quite different from "the uninspiring home surroundings from which a majority of the pupils [in the numerous other adult education classes she had helped organize] came."[8] The teachers were paid by the state. Boarding costs came largely from private donations.

Organized originally for those who had not mastered the three R's, the school later offered a variety of courses

> ranging from beginning reading to economic problems and world situations. All teaching has been informal and down to earth.... Classes were fitted to individual needs and pupils were grouped according to grades, not ages. Thus a white-haired grandmother and a youngster might be in the same classes. Students from sixteen to seventy-plus were welcome.[9]

Cora Wilson Stewart, Emily Griffith, and Wil Lou Gray were but the more colorful, and possibly the most energetic, crusaders for equal educational opportunity for adults. The two hundred plus kindred spirits who helped organize the Department of Adult Education were no less influential in their own communities in advancing the cause and in providing the opportunity. Nor were the obstacles they had to overcome any less formidable.

At the Indianapolis meeting Willie Lawson, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Arkansas, warned against permitting the "sob section" and the "howling reformers" from taking over the movement. Rather than permitting untrained individuals to undertake the teaching of adults she proposed that if "the enthusiasts will stand by and tell the story, while trained people do the work, they will have done their duty well." She also drew attention to the frequently expressed need to educate the educators about adult education. In her address she read a letter from a fellow state superintendent who said, "We devote all our time and money to the education of children to the exclusion of adults." Lawson compared this point-of-view to that of the widow who shared her one day's remaining rations with a prophet. As long as the prophet stayed, the larder was replenished each day. "Would a wise woman have asked him to leave?" she asked. She answered with another question. "Would a wise educator refuse to adopt adult education?"[10]

The Interstate Bulletin

Constantly telling and retelling the story of how obstacles are overcome, citing success stories, and sharing "how to" information has long been an important mix in the fuel that propels adult education and keeps it moving and innovative. It was the felt need for this kind of information that led to the Department of Adult Education taking over publication of the Interstate Bulletin, originally planned by a group of state department personnel called the Interstate Council. The title described its method; an exchange of "State Field Notes"[11] bringing the members up-to-date on what was happening--and where. W.C. Smith, Supervisor of Immigrant Education in New York State served as the volunteer editor. He continued to contribute to the Association in a variety of capacities until 1933 when his term as business manager of the Bulletin expired.

The first issue appeared in January 1925. Six months prior to that time, in July 1924, President Coolidge had addressed the NEA convention at its Washington, D.C. meeting. The President had said: "One of the chief rights of an American citizen is the right to an education. The opportunity to secure it must not only be provided, but if necessary made compulsory".[12] This quotation was prominently displayed on the front page of the new magazine.

Other offerings of the initial issue of the Bulletin were reprints from materials first published in Massachusetts. One, an article on the "Time and Lesson Program for Advanced classes" had originally been prepared for local use by the teachers of Springfield. Another article on course materials for teachers of naturalization classes was taken from a publication of the Massachusetts State Department of Education. (The original source of these articles had not been identified in Vol. 1, No. 1 but was promptly attributed in the next issue). Throughout its history, the Bulletin reflected the same practical emphasis that had been a standard ingredient of the annual meetings.

The second issue of the Bulletin, April-May 1925, included studies undertaken within the states. From Minnesota came a report of the average pay per hour of instructional personnel over a five year period. (The rate rose from $1.24 in 1919-1920 to $1.54 in 1923-1924).[13] Another study, made by Marguerite Burnett, supervisor of immigrant education in Delaware, examined the effects in that state of restricted immigration on four different nationalities, the ages of the students served, and the number of years the students had been in the United States.[*]

The Interstate Bulletin continued to be published until 1934, occasionally interspersed with "Supplements" and "Special Numbers" providing information on methods, materials, word lists, and other instructional aids. The NEA Proceedings continued for another six years to carry the full text of the practice-directed addresses presented annually at the Department's meetings held in connection with the NEA summer convention. This left the pages of the Bulletin available for contributed articles, news, and reprints of studies and instructional materials prepared in local communities and by State Departments of Education. It can be said with little fear of contradiction that of the fifty-one year span, 1921-1972, covered in this study, other than the first few years immediately following the founding of the Adult Education Association of the USA, no period was as rich in the production of practitioner directed materials than were the first ten years of the Department of Adult Education's publication output.

---

[*] In 1921 Congress passed a quota law permitting each country to send to the United States each year three percent of that nationality living in America in 1910. In 1924 the quota was changed to two percent. The law was directed primarily against immigrants from Eastern European countries. (There is no record of the NEA Department of Immigration having either opposed or supported this legislation). Ms. Burnett's study showed a sharp drop in Polish immigrants studying in Delaware, a substantial increase in the ages of students from Poland and Italy, and, generally speaking, an increase in the number of years students had been in the United States.[14]

The decade of the Great Depression wounded, but did not destroy this publication thrust. In 1931, as revenue short-falls beset the NEA itself, the annual Proceedings discontinued its speaker-to-speaker coverage of the Department's summer conference. It then became necessary for the Department to assume responsibility for its publication. The Proceedings of the 1933 meeting, held in Chicago at the time of the Century of Progress World's Fair, were issued as a separate mimeographed publication and mailed directly to the membership. It also doubled as the "fourth edition of the Interstate Bulletin for 1932-1933".[15]

AAAE Assistance

In 1934, help in sustaining the Department's publication continuity came from what only a few years earlier--and a few years later--would be considered a most unlikely source, the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE). Since 1929 the AAAE had been publishing a professionally edited quarterly, the Journal of Adult Education, featuring articles by distinguished authorities, often on the social and political climate of the times and the need for all adults, no matter how advanced their previous level of formal education, to continuously upgrade their educational experience. For several years there was a "special distribution to the membership of some seven hundred of the Department of Adult Education of the NEA."[16]

Although completely different in purpose from the reading matter regularly included in the Interstate Bulletin, for two depression years, 1934-36, the AAAE's quarterly journal, subsidized by grants from the Carnegie Corporation, provided space for the Department's ongoing flow of news and articles formerly published in the Bulletin. Fifteen years later in 1950, the two associations linked their publication efforts once again. This time, however, as an action foreshadowing the ultimate demise of both organizations and the creation of a new organization, the Adult Education Association of the USA.

In the intervening years, as a result of the withdrawal of support by the Carnegie Corporation, the AAAE's Journal of Adult Education underwent, in 1942, a name reversal and a revamped editorial policy. The title of the periodical was changed to the Adult Education Journal and the content shifted to short articles, often written by practicing adult educators. In its reduced size the Journal began to somewhat resemble the

Department's periodical, the *Adult Education Bulletin*.

The *Bulletin* was first published in 1936 as the Department began to pull out of the program limitations imposed by the depression. Over the next fifteen years, as will be discussed in a later chapter, the Department began to seek a membership beyond that of individuals in programs for adults sponsored by the public schools. The content of the *Bulletin* began to change accordingly. In the forties, the periodical reflected a wider and more generalized range of articles than had been true earlier in the Department's history. However, one important new feature of particular interest to public school educators was added. In 1944, Thomas A. Van Sant, director of adult education for the Baltimore school system, published the first of a series of studies on the hourly rates of pay of part-time evening school teachers. (By 1946-47 the national median rate per hour had risen to $2.50). After 1945 articles on veterans education and work conference procedures began to find a place.

The metamorphosis of both the AAAE and the Department, as reflected in their publications, was but one of the many indications that competition was beginning to replace the recent climate of cooperation.[*] It also marked the beginning of a period of self-destruction that resulted in the demise of both organizations in 1951. How can this phenomenon of each organization striving to become more like the other, particularly on the part of the Department of Adult Education, be explained?

---

[*] See also Chapter VI.

An oversimplified assessment of the change dynamics that overtook the AAAE is to say that dependence on an outside source of support left it without a strong enough membership base to continue major aspects of its original program. A fuller account of this part of AAAE's history is to be found in Malcolm Knowles' A History of the Adult Education Movement in the United States.[18]

The story of the Department's evolution from an organization serving a single population group, i.e. individuals employed by the adult education departments of public schools and state departments of education, to one seeking to serve the entire field can be traced in part, to the election following the end of World War II, to office of individuals of limited public school orientation and who were dissatisfied with the modus operandi of the AAAE.

Reaching Out

At the depth of the depression, in 1932, the report of the Department's convention program reflects an expansion of program offerings at the very time revenues for public education were being sharply curtailed. The director of adult education in Minneapolis reported that although "during the school year just completed we have carried on with a reduced budget ... some special programs were initiated". Chief among these were those designed "to help housewives on reduced incomes ... and on public relief to use their food allotments to the best advantage. Through the co-operation of schools, neighborhood houses, and social workers, classes were opened." Katherine Kohler, who presented the report, attested that these programs had not only resulted "in better and more satisfying meals" but also "fewer periods of enforced fasting".[19] Other examples of the schools reaching out to help individuals cope with enforced leisure, including the provision of additional vocational training, were reported underway in Chicago and throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In general, as A.W. Castle, director of extension education for Pennsylvania said:

> Through the slow but effective leavening of our extension education for adults, literacy with all its social implications, the genuine assimilation of our foreign-born, vocational retraining, leisure-time occupation, crime and juvenile delinquency, prison education, parent education, the enrichment of rural life, home study, library services, social ends and social control,--all are now for the first time, getting the serious consideration due them.[20]

It is to be regretted, of course, that it took an economic depression to fully highlight the social implications of a continuing education.

In spite of the efforts of public education agencies to expand their services, promote professional development programs, and work cooperatively with a wide variety of community agencies, Morse A. Cartwright, executive director of the AAAE at first found it difficult to overcome an early prejudice. In a solicited article in a 1928 issue of the *Adult Education Bulletin* he acknowledged his chief claim to knowledge of the public school system "was that he was a product of it."[21] Drawing further evidence from a book by Owen Evans on *Educational Opportunities for Young Workers*, Cartwright expresses his own opinion that "most young men and women over fourteen years of age have acquired a distaste for schooling." He then adds, "when the public school people desire the necessary machinery to overcome the prevalent distaste for their wares, they will have overcome the greatest obstacle to adult education in the public schools."[21] As he later came to learn, Cora Wilson Stewart, Wil Lou Gray, Emily Griffith, and all the other school people with a vision and who helped found the Department of Adult Education, populated its conferences, and contributed to its journal would have advised him differently.

As will be discussed in Chapter V, many reasons can be advanced to account for the AAAE initially distancing itself not only from adult education as practiced by the public schools but, to some extent, from institutional programs in general. An additional reason, more relevant to this chapter, could well be the scarcity of public school representation on the Executive Council of the Association. As Malcolm Knowles has noted, "the name of a public school adult educator appeared in the roster of the Executive Board in 1931-32 and not again until 1937-38."[22]

At its Annual Meeting in 1929 at the University of North Carolina, the first to be held in the South, Wil Lou Gray, along with Elizabeth Morris, director of community schools in Buncomb County, North Carolina, spoke on the assigned topic "Public Schools and Adult Education." L.R. Alderman, specialist in adult education, U.S. Bureau of Education, presided.

Over the next dozen years, the subject of adult education and the public schools began to somewhat sporadically appear on the program of the annual meetings of the association.[23] In 1930 and 1932, vocational education was addressed. John Studebaker, superintendent of schools in Des Moines and later Commissioner of Education was a favorite. Appearing on a program listed under the general rubric of public school adult education in 1933 he spoke about the Des Moines forum project. In 1941 and

1942, after he had been named U.S. Commissioner of Education, he was again a platform guest.

Following the appearance of Wil Lou Gray in 1929, no adult education practitioner, other than from the field of vocational education, appeared on an annual meeting program until the 10th Anniversary Celebration in 1936. At that meeting, A.W. Castle was the initial speaker on the topic "The Schools and Adult Education". It was not until 1947 that a full contingent of state and local directors appeared together at one of the sectional meetings. In the time provided (the meeting was scheduled for 11 A.M. and had to adjourn in time for the annual luncheon), Evertt Preston, Director of the Division of Adult Education for New Jersey led a panel composed of six local directors and one other representative of a state department. The topic selected for discussion was as comprehensive as the time was short, "Problems and Programs of Community Adult Education as Related to the Public schools: Legislative Aspects; Local and State Support."

One of the participants on Preston's panel was Sarah F. Smith, director of adult education in Stamford, Connecticut and the daughter of William C. Smith, a founder of the Department of Immigrant Education and first editor of the Interstate Bulletin.

For the Department to have continued indefinitely along the relatively smooth path it had charted for itself might, in time, have made for something less than an interesting history. However, as this portion of the adult education story eventually played itself out, the final, full decade of the Department's organizational existence became an influential part of a momentous decade.

Chapter IV

REFERENCES

1. Department of Adult Education. *Proceedings of the Department of Adult Education*. *NEA Convention held at Indianapolis, Indiana, 1925*. Washington, D.C.: the Department, 1925. p. 28. (Reprint from NEA *Addresses and Proceedings*, 1925).

2. *Ibid*. p. 26.

3. NEA *Proceedings*, 1923. p. 672.

4. Department of Adult Education. *Op. cit*. p. 3.

5. *Ibid*. p. 5.

6. Bluemel, E. *The Golden Opportunity*: *The Story of Emily Griffith Opportunity School of Denver*. Denver, Colorado, Johnson Publishing Co., 1965. p. 6.

7. *Ibid*. p. 8.

8. Montgomery, Mable. *South Carolina's Wil Lou Gray*. Columbia, S.C., Vogue Press., 1963. p. 41.

9. *Ibid*. p. 55.

10. Department of Adult education. *Op. cit*. p. 14 - 18.

11. National Education Association, Department of Immigrant Education. *Interstate Bulletin* 1:1. January 1925. (Masthead).

12. *Ibid*. p. 1.

13. "Evening Schools Maintained Under the Supervision of the Department of Education, Minnesota." *Interstate Bulletin*, Vol. 2, No. 2. Washington, D.C.; The (NEA) Department of Immigrant Education, April-May, 1925. p.6.

14. Burnett, Marguerite H. "Changing Character of Enrollment." Interstate *Bulletin*", Vol.1, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: The (NEA) Department of Immigrant Education, April-May, 1925. p.7.

15. Proceedings of the Department of Adult Education of the National Education Association, Chicago Meeting, July 3-4-5-6, 1933. p. 6. (Mimeo) (Archives of NEA).

16. Cartwright, Morse A. Ten Years of Adult Education. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1935. pp.38-39.

17. Van Sant, Thomas A. "Adult Education Salaries". Adult Education Bulletin. 12:4,; December, 1947.

18. Knowles, Malcolm. A History of the Adult education Movement in the United States. N.Y. Holt, Rinehart,and Winston, 1962. Chapter VI, "Strivings for a National Organization for Adult Education", 1924-1961:, pp. 190-245.

19. Proceedings of the Department of Adult Education. 1933. op. cit. p. 6.

20. Ibid. p. 5.

21. Cartwright, Morse A. "The Public School and the Adult Education Movement." Interstate Bulletin. 3: 3-4; July-Aug., 1928.

22. Knowles, Malcolm. op. cit. p. 212.

23. All references to AAAE Annual Meetings are taken from the collection of programs found in the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections at Syracuse University. Filed under Adult Education Association Collections, Box 6, AAAE Annual Meetings folder, 1927-1936.

Chapter V

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Like the Department of Immigrant Education, the AAAE did not come to life in a matter of a day or two.

Over a period of four years the staff and trustees of the Carnegie Corporation of New York had been discussing ways of discharging in the most effective way possible the Corporation's chartered purpose: "To promote the advancement of the diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States".[1] Eventually, as a result of many deliberations, on March 24, 1926, in Chicago's Drake Hotel an organization did evolve to be made up of "individuals deemed most capable of helping Carnegie achieve its goals."[2] The specific motivation behind the Corporation's interest in founding an association is variously interpreted. Malcolm Knowles credits Frederick P. Keppel, who became president of the Corporation in 1923, as "introducing the vision of a unified field."[3] Amy Rose, another scholar who has carefully probed the archives of the Carnegie Corporation on this question, sees the origin of the Association somewhat differently. It is her reasoning that "the founding of the AAAE was directly related to the internal policy and administration of the Carnegie corporation. The heart of the Carnegie interest lay in its original mandate to advance and diffuse knowledge."[3]

Undoubtedly, both are right. One motivation fed the other.

Harold Stubblefield, leaving any exploration of the dynamics of organizational creation to others, sums up the resolution of the years of discussion between members of the Carnegie staff and their numerous advisors this way: "The Carnegie Corporation's activity in adult education was an experiment to promote a particular idea about adult education and to foster its acceptance among organizations that claimed to have adult education as their major interest."[4] Stubblefield identifies the "particular idea" of adult education the Corporation sought to advance as "liberal education."[5]

Differences and Similarities

Like the Department, the AAAE had a sponsor. That the Carnegie Corporation made a major investment in underwriting the Association, and that the NEA's monetary backing of the Department was minuscule by comparison, does not change an important part of the equation. Both organizations had the security of knowing that a large and highly respected institution was standing behind them.

Unlike the Department, the AAAE was tightly controlled by its sponsor, or, if not directly by the Corporation, by its agent. Morse Cartwright, a former ranking member of the

Corporation's staff was named executive director of the association within weeks of the its founding. From the beginning of its existence, all major items of business, including the election of the Association's officers, was transacted by the Association's Executive Board. The Board, numbering between 12 and 18 members, was elected by a Council of 100. The Executive Board, however, elected the officers of the Association, of whom the director was one, from among its own membership. As Knowles says, although the "Board was, in fact, the true governing body of the association ... it delegated much of its responsibility to a smaller executive committee."[6] The authority of the nominating committee was limited to recommending individuals to serve on the Executive Board. The role of the membership committee to recommending to the Executive Council nominations for membership in the Association.

The Department of Immigrant Education grew out of the felt needs of practitioners to communicate with each other. To do this they first created a networking system called the Interstate Council. The AAAE grew out of the felt need of an eleemosynary institution to foster interest in, and use of, one of its program objectives. One was a top-down mission, the other an across-the-board undertaking.

The AAAE was responsible for articulating adult eduction as a cause worth supporting. It helped give a new movement credibility and, following carefully designed field studies, published reports that began to rapidly fill the gap of research and theory required to push ahead an education discipline seeking to establish its own identity. The Journal of Adult Education quickly established itself as a periodical which, to read, represented an education in itself. The annual meetings of the association were an extension of the quality and content of the Journal.

Individual members of the Department did a certain amount of fact-finding research, the reports of which appeared in the Interstate Bulletin. It held practice-oriented annual conferences and worked hard on the custodians of power within state and local schools systems and members of state legislatures, to increase public support for adult education. It encouraged aggressive membership solicitation.

In terms of a view of the tasks confronting them, members of the AAAE seemed most concerned with what ought to be. Members of the Department were concerned with how to improve and extend what is. Given proper cross-pollination, this combination of complementing philosophic strains had the makings of an ideal partnership.

The Department and the AAAE

Contrary to the understanding of some, the involvement of the Department of Adult Education and the leadership of state and local school systems was not ignored in the steps leading to the founding of the AAAE. To pave the way for the organization of AAAE, the Carnegie Corporation convened a national meeting of representatives of public and private, formal and informal, educational interests at the Cleveland Public Library on October 16 and 17, 1925. The announced purpose was to "discuss quite informally all the different aspects" of forming an organization that would be "cooperative and advisory in character [to] give impetus, solidarity, and drive to all parts of the movement."[7] Charles Herlihy, president of the Department of Adult Education attended. Also present were the superintendents of schools in Cleveland and Denver, both cities with successful public school adult education programs. L.R. Alderman, adult education specialists in the U.S. Bureau of Education and later to become president of the Department was also present.

The Cleveland conference came to "unanimous agreement that the interests and activity in adult education revealed by the [AAAE] organizing committee and its investigators warranted the formation of a national body for coordination and mutual assistance."[7] Four regional meetings of individuals invited by the Corporation were then held in the four months preceding another national meeting at which time the new organization would be formed. Thirty to forty individuals attended each of the regional meetings. Each of these groups were then requested to select eight of their number to attend the final organizing meeting in Chicago. In attendance at this meeting were 23 delegates plus members of the Corporation's staff and its advisory committee, now called the Executive Committee.[8]

Among the delegates were Alvin Johnson, director of the New School for Social Research in New York City; Judson Jennings, librarian of the Seattle Public Library; J.J. Didcoct, professor of education at George Peabody College in Nashville; W.D. Henderson, director of extension at the University of Michigan; John A. Lapp, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare council; Jennie Flexner, at the time, readers advisor for the Louisville Public Library and later to become readers advisor at the New York Public Library; Olive D. Campbell, secretary of the Southern Mountain Workers; J.H. Puelicher, past president of the American Bankers Association and chair of its Education Committee; Leon J. Richardson, Dean of Extension at the University of California (and chair of both the Executive Committee and the AAAE founding conference); J.L.

Kerchen, education director of the California State Federation of Labor; and Agnes Nestor, president of the Womens Trade Union League of Chicago. The three public school representatives were I.S. Noall, state supervisor of adult education in Utah; Ethel Richardson, assistant state superintendent of adult education in California and W.T. Bawden, associate superintendent of schools in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Among those invited to attend the meeting but unable to participate was Eduard Lindeman, Professor of Social Psychology at the New York School of Social Work.

Recognizing that the Cleveland and regional meetings brought together a highly diversified assembly of educational interests, the public schools were as well represented as any other single interest. If the 14 individuals who attended the final organizational meeting I have been able to occupationally identify can be considered a representative sample (not counting staff and Executive Committee members), representatives of the public schools accounted for three of those I have named. Three individuals represented colleges and universities, two of whom were extension directors and past presidents of the National University Extension Association. Two were from public libraries, and six came from a variety of voluntary agencies. However, of the various interest groups represented at the Chicago meeting, the public schools would be the one that had no voice in AAAE governance once the organization was underway.

It is quite probable that this was not an issue for members of the Department. In any event there is no evidence of it being interpreted as such in the pages of the Interstate Bulletin. To the extent the members of the Department's Executive Committee thought about this situation at all, they probably saw adult education as a long continuum stretching from remedial education and education for special groups at its one end, to enriched and continuing education for the already well educated at the other. So be it. The members of the Department had their job to do. Let the Carnegie Corporation do what it had to do.

Cartwright and Bradford

Even as the AAAE and the Department of Adult education shared similar ties and differences, so did the executives that headed them. As will be detailed in a later chapter, Leland Bradford took over the leadership of an organization that had a history of what might be termed a representative democracy. Bradford quickly turned the association into one that would forward his vision of the primary goals of adult education. Cartwright became the executive director of an organization that already had its goals set for it and which he himself had helped shape. Cartwright saw it as his task to protect and preserve the program the Carnegie Corporation had in mind. It is far from unrealistic not to think that in behind-the-scenes maneuvers, he and his closest advisors (the Executive Committee that managed the preliminary meetings leading up to the organizational meeting in Chicago), orchestrated the events that led to a carefully controlled governance pattern for AAAE and to Cartwright's election as its director.

The members of the Department had no voice in the naming of Leland Bradford as executive secretary of the Department. The members of the AAAE had scarcely more in the naming of the executive director of their association.

The struggle for economic survival that accompanied the withdraw of funds by the Carnegie Corporation from the AAAE, brought about a democratization of that association. Bradford's directive leadership of the Department alienated him from many of the state and local directors who represented its core membership to the extent that, rather than controlling them, he lost the opportunity to influence them.

Many members of AAAE saw Morse Cartwright as aloof and supercilious. As one reader of one of the drafts of several of these chapters expressed it, Cartwright seemed to convey to those who were not a part of his inner circle the impression that those outside it were upstarts from the hinterland. John Holden, a long-time member of the Department, and then of the National

Association of Public School Adult Educators, said of Bradford, "if he could have been more like us, we could have been more like him." What I think he was saying was that if Bradford and the members of his inner circle, those who were associated with him in the founding of the National Training Laboratories, had made a greater effort to acquaint themselves with the concerns of the administrators of adult education in the public schools, they would not so strongly have resisted his exposure of them to the precepts of applied group dynamics.

Cartwright had come to the Carnegie Corporation from a position in the Extension Division of the University of California. He was accustomed to the company of the intellectually elite, lived in the exclusive suburb of Scarsdale, N.Y., and was strongly opposed to federal aid for education on the basis that it destroyed local control. Although I attended annual meetings of AAAE at West Point and Des Moines, and served for two years as a member of the Executive Council, my closest direct contact with him was when he sat in briefly at a meeting of the Committee on Community Organization which I chaired. At the meeting in the offices of the Association in New York City he stepped in during the progress of the discussion. I assumed the purpose of the visit was to discover what we were doing and to share in the deliberations. Since that did not happen, I gained the distinct impression his principal purpose was to honor us with his presence.

Bradford never lost his middle-western casualness. He made no effort to purposefully display his very considerable intellectual versatility and was never known for being fastidious in any manner or way. He lived as comfortably at one time on his forty acre farm in Northern Virginia as he did later in a townhouse in Washington's Georgetown. Despite his knowledge of the classics, he was an iconoclast who disdained the Great Books as the last word on eternal verities and preferred instead the empiricalism of John Dewey.

Cartwright and Bradford, of course, knew each other and appeared together several times at meetings of the Department in the early forties. I was never in Cartwright's company long enough to hear him express an opinion about Bradford, nor do I ever remember Bradford mentioning Cartwright's name.

Both Bradford and Cartwright will be remembered and talked about as long as adult education struggles for the intellectual, economic, and philosophic consideration it requires. Each man made a contribution; each one inhibited at different times and in different ways, the normal growth of a free and voluntary association of adult educators.

Had their personalities permitted, they would have collectively advanced the theory and practice of adult education to a far greater extent than was possible in their self-imposed exile from each other.

Chapter V

REFERENCES

1. Learned, William S. The American Public Library and the Diffusion of Knowledge. N.Y.: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1924, p. 3.

2. Rose, Amy D. "Beyond Classroom Walls: The Carnegie Corporation and the Founding of the American Association for Adult Education." Adult Education Quarterly 39: p. 141.

3. Knowles, Malcolm S. A History of the Adult Education Movement in the United States. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. p. 190.

4. Stubblefield, Harold W. Towards a History of Adult Education in America. London: Croon Helm, 1988. p. 22.

5. Ibid. p. 26.

6. Knowles. op. cit. p. 200.

7. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 70, Annual Meetings Programs Folder, Printed invitation and names list --September 19, 1925. George Arents Research Library for Special Collections at Syracuse University (GARLSU).

8. Ibid. Invitation to attend a meeting to be held at Town Hall, NYC. November 23, 1925. (GARLSU).

9. Carnegie Corporation Office Memorandum. (1926). National Conference Delegates (Series II, No. 20), Carnegie Corporation Archives, New York.

Chapter VI

THE ROOTS OF CONFLICT: 1938-1943

In the 1930's and 1940's two catastrophic events occurred that were to have a profound effect on the public's thinking about the purposes of adult education and the attitudes of adult educators about the purposes of two of the organizations that had been established to help them in their work. First came a worldwide economic depression. Then a worldwide war.

During the thirties, the depression years, emergency educational programs for both young and old adults not only gave work to unemployed teachers, but vastly increased opportunities for new learning on the part of more than two million adults. An important aspect of the educational activities carried on under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) was the precedent set in establishing the role of the Federal government in supporting non-vocational, less than collegiate level, educational programs for adults.

The emergency programs also stimulated an important leap forward in the provision of professional development opportunities for teachers, supervisors and other leaders within the world of adult education. According to Mildred Wiese, specialist in curriculum construction and in-service training for the Education Division of WPA, "most of the 28,000 teachers in the program of adult education and nursery school under the Works Progress Administration have attended conferences, long or short, designed to help them prepare for the coming year, to keep abreast of new knowledge ... and in readiness to return to public school or other employment."[1]

One result of this emphasis on professional development was that membership in the Department of Adult Education grew from 2,233 to 3,730 in the 1938-1939 school year as a new body of practitioners sought a congenial professional home.[2]

During World War II, the pursuit of victory left little time for the professional development of adult educators. It did, however, have the effect of emphasizing community interdependence and stimulated an extended use of the public schools in meeting community needs. It also had an impact in stimulating interest in the study of geography, energizing long-range community planning driven by a concern about the effects of demobilization, and encouraging public affairs education in general.

In 1943, as a field representative for the 7th Regional Office of Civil Defense headquartered in Omaha, I had an opportunity to observe remarkable examples of community cooperation and the swift rise of indigenous community leadership. The restrictions placed on transportation brought about the development of community calendars, essential for the avoidance of conflicts in scheduling that, under emergency conditions, could seriously disrupt the community's infrastructure. Volunteer bureaus arose overnight to assist in pooling human resources. Countless city dwellers who had been totally dependent on the grocery store for fresh produce now, during the spring and summer months, walked to what probably had been a weed-infested vacant lot to tend their allotted space in the community Victory Garden. It is also true, there was a general breakdown of the block plan for non-disaster preparedness in urban centers, there were often obstacles to finding jobs for volunteers, and no systematic attempt at meaningful evaluation.

In some communities a new kind of Chautauqua evolved as members of a neighborhood came together to hear descriptions of far away war zones presented by individuals who had been there in an earlier time. Before moving to Omaha, I had crisscrossed Colorado in the company of a professor of Oriental history at the University of Colorado together with the dean of the University's Extension Division. Our mission was to conduct a series of workshops designed to stimulate discussion and understanding of the conflict in the Orient.

The activity was sponsored by the University's Extension Division in cooperation with the Colorado State Department of Public Instruction and the State Library. In many communities throughout the country, the local public school and/or the local public library often became the hub around which these and similar programs could take place. One or the other of the agencies, but particularly the public school, frequently become a center for community education.

One result of this war-born activity was that school officials and members of their staffs, whether or not a formally organized adult education program was in place within the school, were often obliged to spend considerable time building relationships with dispensers of other forms of community service --the agricultural and home demonstration agents, members of Selective Service and Rationing Boards, the leadership of voluntary associations pledged to do their part in the war effort, subject matter specialists drawn from nearby college and universities, and influential members of business and labor groups.

All associations of adult educators were now forced to rethink the most effective ways of meeting the new and increased service obligations of their members. In addition, the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) and the NEA Department of Adult Education were faced with the challenge of meeting a financial crisis imposed almost simultaneously upon them.

The economic woes besetting the organizations had quite different origins. In 1941 the Carnegie Corporation, the financial backer of the AAAE, after due notice, withdrew its long-range support. For the Department, a pending financial crisis was brought about in the same year as the federal emergency education programs began to be dismantled. Teachers and others in those programs who had been members in the Department were going off to war, to work in the defense establishments, or back to teaching regular school. AAAE and the Department both had the need to either install a membership development program--or redirect an existing one. The AAAE had previously felt little pressure to build a large membership as a means of continuing support. The Department's need was to replace those members who did not enroll as the WPA program came to an end. As of mid-1941 its membership had fallen to "approximately 2,000."[3] The AAAE 's immediate response to a lack of revenue was to curtail programs and sharply reduce staff. Both organizations had to now seek new sources of support.

The ERA of Good Feeling

A historical flashback would clearly indicate that during the thirties the two organizations had lived together in general harmony. When the first issue of the AAAE's Journal of Adult Education was published in 1929, the Interstate Bulletin greeted it with a full page article written by the Journal's editor, Mary

Ely.[4] True, one year earlier Morse Cartwright had denigrated the capability of the public schools to effectively assist in the education of adults.[5] However, his later actions would indicate that after more contact with members of the Department he would soften his views. The first meaningful encounter with a public school adult educator was undoubtedly at AAAE's meeting in Chapel Hill in 1929. Wil Lou Gray, the dynamic founder of the North Carolina Opportunity school, together with one of her colleagues, made a platform appearance and assisted with the local arrangements.

Four years later Cartwright indicated he was well satisfied with a publishing arrangement made earlier with the Department. For two years, the Department's periodical, the Adult Education Bulletin, was published as a section of the Adult Education Journal. In his annual report for 1933, Cartwright wrote, "the bonds of interest and sympathy between the N.E.A. Department and the Association that have resulted from working together during the two years of this joint publication will hold firm and will, it is hoped, continue to add strength to the work of both organizations.[6] Evidence that they would, at least for several years, is found in the service of Cartwright as associate editor of the Bulletin from early 1937 through 1940.

For the next five years both organizations prospered.

Carnegie's support of the AAAE continued and, although the depression also continued, so did the emergency educational programs of the federal government; programs that generated members for the Department. The NEA subsidy to the Department for the fiscal year 1938-39 was back to $900.00 from the low of $500.00 it had averaged in the depths of the depression.* During these years, the Bulletin of the Department and the Journal of the AAAE (except for the two years when the Department's publication was issued as a section of AAAE's periodical) reported on the activities of the other association.

The era of good feeling persisted even though since its founding the Department had been gradually widening its membership clause. In 1924, the By-laws had defined membership as open to "active members of the National Education Association who are engaged full or part time in the work of teaching, supervising, or administrating adult education of students above the compulsory school age ... in the preparation for naturalization, and all persons who are engaged in preparing persons to do this work...."[7] In 1938 a membership clause was accepted which simply read, "membership in this Department shall be open to all who are actively engaged or interested in adult education work, upon the payment of annual membership fee of one dollar."[8]

---

*In the late twenties and early thirties the NEA Board of directors authorized a lump sum, usually totalling between 12 and 14 thousand dollars, for the non self-supporting Departments, about eight in all. Specific allocations were left to the Executive Committee. For the years beginning July 1, 1929, 1930, and 1931 the Department's share was $1,000 annually.

That the amendment expressed the ever widening interaction of the public school program in many communities with other educational agencies seems to have been universally accepted. That it found no disfavor with the leadership of the AAAE is attested by the willingness of Morse Cartwright to speak one year later at the Department's annual meeting in San Francisco. In his address, "Some New Directions in Adult Education", after acknowledging the public schools as the "probable chief gathering place for adults in search of an education in the future,"[9] he then pressed for the building of school facilities suitable for community use and urged cooperative, informal programs which would make available additional opportunities for cultural, vocational, and recreational learning. It is quite likely that he saw any expansion of the Department's membership beyond public school teachers and administrators as a welcome ally in widening opportunities for diversified programming.

The 1938 amendment was adopted during the presidency of Maude Aiton, principal of the Americanization School in Washington, D.C. The president of the Department at the time

Cartwright spoke in San Francisco was George Mann, Chief of the Division of Adult and Continuation Education for the California State Department of Education. While Aiton represented a highly specialized aspect of adult education, and Mann was the overseer of a highly diversified state program, both were unyielding advocates of the public schools as legitimate dispensers of adult education. Both were on cordial terms with Morse Cartwright. Both were committed to community involvement in program planning. In the report of the president for 1938, Ms. Aiton, in the same paragraph, thanked the "NEA for substantial help in the form of a subsidy" and the AAAE for "help financially" in giving "our members an opportunity to have the publications of the organization."[10]

Between the end of the depression and the outbreak of the war in Europe, each organization accepted the right of the other to be what it was. The Department had no quarrel with the AAAE's emphasis on liberal adult education; the AAAE no longer looked upon the Department as an organization encouraging programs unworthy of bearing the mantle of adult education.

A Decade of Rivalry

But then it happened! A sequence of events began to unfold that would reverse more than a decade of interdependence and usher in a decade of rivalry that would lead to the ultimate dissolution of both organizations. The first of these was a change in the composition of the Department's leadership.

In 1940-'42 the Department's president was W.S. Robertson, director of adult education for the Louisiana State Department of Education. The vice-president was Caroline Whipple, acting chief of the Bureau of Adult Education in New York state. Both, obviously, were fully knowledgeable about adult education in the public schools and able to communicate freely with its practitioners. Robertson appointed as editor of the Bulletin Paul Sheats, the energetic, affable assistant professor of adult education at the University of Wisconsin.

With Sheats as editor, several new features were immediately added to the Bulletin. One, in 1941, was an "Analysis of Opportunities for Professional Study in the Field of Adult Education" prepared annually thereafter for ten years by Cyril O. Houle, an assistant professor at the University of Chicago. At the time, both Sheats and Houle were in the early stages of careers that would lead to their emergence as internationally acclaimed leaders in their profession. During the second year of Sheats' tenure as editor, some changes in layout and format were introduced. More articles appeared describing programs carried on by agencies other than the public schools and the number of issues was increased from four each year to six. A new section known as "Over the Editors' Desk" provided a platform from which Sheats could share with the membership his thoughts about adult education and adult education organizations. As editor, Sheats was also a member of the Department's Executive Committee.

Non Public School Leadership

In 1942, Sheats was elected President of the Department for a two-year term. Roben J. Maaske, president of Eastern Oregon College of Education at La Grande was elected vice-president. Before becoming president of the Oregon College, Maaske had earlier been deputy superintendent of public instruction in the Oregon Department of Public Instruction, an assignment which included supervision of adult education. Leland Bradford was named by Sheats as editor of the Bulletin. For the first time in its history, the Department had as three of its most influential leaders individuals who, at best, had either no, or but marginal experience as an adult education practitioner in a local school system, had not had a primary responsibility for adult education in a state department of education, and were not currently employed by a state or local school system.

Bradford and Sheats first met at an adult education conference in Illinois in 1940. They quickly became good friends and "this link of ... colleagueship was forged."[11] It was after Bradford became director of training at the Federal Security

Agency that Sheats, who was then president of the Department, invited Bradford to assume the editorship of the Bulletin. While by no means neglecting articles of practitioner interest, first Sheats, and then Bradford, gradually opened the coverage of the magazine to articles of wider professional concern. When the war was in progress, the Bulletin provided excellent coverage of educational programs underway in the military and civilian war agencies. After the war, one of the most regularly covered areas of interest was that relating to the work conferences sponsored by the Department and activities associated with, or growing out of, the program of the National Training Laboratories.

Quite different in some respects, Bradford and Sheats had much in common. Intellectually acute, they could engage in long and productive conversations on the theoretical underpinnings of their major interests. They had the ability to look ahead from what was toward what might be. Although Bradford disclaimed any further interest in research after he received his graduate degree, he was wholeheartedly committed to looking on most of his major undertakings as an experiment or as "action research." "My respect for research was great" he said, "but I had done all I wanted during my graduate days and I was not interested in doing more."[12]

Sheats had begun attending meetings of adult education organizations, the Department included, during the time he was assistant administrator of the Federal Forum Project. His natural charm, quick intelligence, outstanding gifts as both speaker and a writer, as well as his experience in the U.S. Office of Education, moved him quickly into the front line of Departmental leadership.

Sheats and Bradford were both repelled by authoritarianism--but for different reasons. Bradford, because it interfered with the freedom of movement he felt he required if he were to be successful in whatever he undertook. Sheats, because it did not square with his concept of democratic participation. One of Sheats' many skills was his platform effectiveness. Bradford, a master at sizing up individual capabilities--or absence thereof--was particularly effective in bringing small groups of individuals to see and accept his point of view. Both wrote well, sometimes eloquently, and used their editorial position within the Department to repeatedly call for an expanded role for adult education--and for the Department's role in bringing about growth and change. Together they were a formidable pair.

Prior to becoming a leader within the Department, Sheats had served as a director of the local Federal Forum Project in Chattanooga and then attained national visibility as the assistant to the national director, John Studebaker, the U.S.

Commissioner of Education. While still president of the Department, Sheats continued to live in Washington D.C. and became head of New Tools for Learning, a cooperative project of the University of Chicago that was then engaged in producing study materials built around the regular Sunday afternoon broadcast of a highly regarded forum discussion, the University of Chicago Round Table. His next stop, 1944-46, was education director of the Town Hall, a center for lecture and study programs located in New York City.

With an extensive background in planning and stimulating citizen participation in public affairs, his major interest was directed more toward encouraging this kind of program offering on the part of all providers, than in maintaining the institutional health of any one. Important as this program goal was, and with a double incentive to promote it during war time, the needed implementing instruments could not be provided without functioning adult education institutions to offer them. Equally important was the strength in numbers required by an organization or institution if it were to secure the funds required to sustain public affairs offerings.

A logical extension of Sheats' views about program content was that it was important to welcome into membership representatives of labor education, cooperative and general extension, and voluntary associations.[13] This position had legal authorization in the amendment to the constitution passed by the Department's membership in 1938 even though the intent at that time was to promote cooperation in programs of community education.

Bradford supported Sheats' view of an ever widening constituency for the Department. In addition, he aspired to involve the wider representation in direction-finding not only for the public school segment, but for the entire field of adult education. In 1941, while still at the University of Illinois and editor of the Illinois Adult Education News, he had written an article entitled "A Call for National Leadership." It was a concise, well reasoned presentation; one that he himself thought well enough of that he would later say "partly as a result of the article ... and partly because adult education was growing, a Joint National Adult Education Conference was held in Detroit." (The 1946 conference of five national organizations held five years later). Paul Sheats, then editor of the Bulletin reprinted the article within two months of its original publication.

Bradford's Vision of an Adequate Organization

Bradford's article set forth six objectives for an "adequate national organization." In defining the direction adult education must take, he observed that "these objectives must be crystallized from the thinking and experience of the field and must be drawn from all areas of the country and from all agencies, whether private, state or federal." In the second and third numbered paragraphs he declares that the leadership of such an organization must be "truly representative of the entire field" and that it "must encourage ... experimentation" and provide "means through publications of making ... results available."

The fourth characteristic identified was establishing state and local organizations of adult education. The fifth was "encouraging desirable legislation affecting adult education" and the sixth, "help in developing professionalism."[14]

Although the author asserted that the suggestions were directed toward "no existing organization" they were clearly not aimed at the National University Extension Organization, the National Association of County Agricultural Agents, the National Home Study Council or any of several other organizations with a major responsibility for the education of adults. They were almost certainly a catalog of what, in Bradford's opinion, the AAAE was not doing.

It would be impossible to argue that the AAAE had not already done its part in defining adult education. However, those who undertook to do the defining were by no means representative of the broad spectrum of adult education. (See Chapter V). The AAAE did nothing to promote federal legislation favorable to adult education and, while some AAAE loyalists might claim the association did much to advance professionalism, even its strongest advocates could not help but agree that its publications were frequently less than specific as to how practitioners could go about the task of teaching and planning adult education activities.

The Department, on the other hand, especially so in the absence of a paid executive, was dependent on the volunteer leadership of a biennially elected president and executive committee. It thus did meet the renewal requirement of drawing leadership from the field. In all of the publication stages through which the Bulletin had passed, it never failed to direct some of its articles toward practitioner needs and interests. The Department had a long history of advocating federal legislation in support of adult education.

From the time of the original appearance of his article in 1941 until the formation in 1951 of the Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA), Bradford sought to transform the Department into an all inclusive, multi-purpose organization. His vision for the Department was that it could successfully meet the needs of all adult educators, irrespective of their institutional affiliation; an aspiration that, as the future would demonstrate, was not shared by the general membership. In advancing his views, he often used the language of the 1938 constitutional amendment as his sanction.

In 1942 the mid-winter meeting of the Department was again held in San Francisco. Of the five themes on which general sessions were held, one was "Benefits of a National Organization." The major presentation was made by T.H. Shelby, dean of extension at the University of Texas. He affirmed that "adult education has now come into its own, and that the greatest need at the present time is for a democratic, nationwide association that will be representative of adult education workers in the field."[16] This was the first sounding of a refrain to be heard many times in the future as the Department's leadership began to challenge the pre-eminent position of the AAAE as the generic, non-institutionally centered, national adult education organization.

In the business session that followed the Shelby address, three actions were taken designed to begin restructuring the Department from an organization with a well defined clientele of public school adult educators into an all inclusive association. First was the passage of a motion for the president to appoint a committee to draw-up a plan which would bring lay groups and agencies into membership. Second, the "suggestion" was made that steps be taken to change the name from a "department" to a "national association". Third, president Sheats presented a "plan for the affiliation of state and local associations of adult education with the department." With the exception of California, it is likely that most of the state and local associations at that time were microcosms of the AAAE to a far greater extent than they were of the Department.

The "report was discussed at some length." The final resolution authorized "the president and Mr. Maxwell* [to] constitute a committee to work out a provisional plan for state and local associations to affiliate with the Department."[17]

Five months later, July 1942, during the summer meeting of the Department at the NEA Convention in Denver, Maaske, as chair of the "Committee on Reorganization", presented the committee's report. It consisted of a recommendation that the title of Article III of the Constitution be amended to read "Membership and Affiliation of State and other Adult Education Associations and Councils." Section One of the proposed new Article stated that "membership ... is open to adult education teachers, administrators, lay leaders, workers and others interested in adult education...." Section two provided for the affiliation of "state and regional association" and "other organizations ... such as adult education councils, associations of adult principals or administrators, and local adult education groups...."[1]" Acceptance of the report by two-thirds of those present and voting at the Denver meeting was sufficient authorization to install the constitutional change.

---

*G.L. Maxwell had been assistant director of the Education Division of the Works Progress Administration before becoming associate director of the NEA Educational Policies Commission. In that capacity he also served for four years as NEA Staff Representative for the Department. In June 1944 he began service as administrative dean at the University of Denver.

Competition for Members Begins

Although the term "lay leaders" was not further defined, it fully implied that the Department was ready to accept into membership a wide array of individuals who, up until then, had been considered one of the principal constituencies of the AAAE. Newton D. Baker, a Cleveland attorney and Secretary of War in President Wilson's Cabinet; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, an established novelist; and Charles Beard, the historian; were but three of the distinguished "lay leaders" who served as presidents of AAAE. The AAAE also had long established its interest in the educational activities of men's and women's service clubs, alumni associations, and the educational efforts of health, welfare, and cultural groups. The seemingly innocent language which extended the opportunity for affiliation to adult education councils was an even more direct assault on AAAE territory. The adult education council movement could almost be said to have been an invention of the AAAE. The Councils were local groups, generally limited to the larger cities, and representing such diverse areas of educational interest as museums; libraries; ethnic, patriotic, and racial groupings; religious organizations; university extension and evening colleges; men's luncheon clubs and women's afternoon groups, and, of course, the public schools.

The adoption of this amendment opened an even wider constitutional avenue for the Department to seek to influence and become the champion of these many groups. Because of the passionate interest Paul Sheats had in raising the level of social and political intelligence of the American people, and because of Bradford's rapidly developing convictions about group discussion as a principal method of social education, such redirection undoubtedly seemed appropriate and worth whatever short-circuting of member participation in direction-finding as reaching a policy decision of this magnitude might entail.

The Committee on Reorganization which drafted the amendment was composed of two individuals identified with universities (Maaske and Shelby), a state director (Mann), and a former official of the WPA education program (Mildred Wiese). They were probably joined in their deliberations by G.L. Maxwell and Paul

Sheats. It is unreasonable to project that the committee members constituted a cabal scheming to find a means of undermining the AAAE. It is certain, however, that the committee as constituted did not take its charge to "restructure" as an opportunity to seek collaboration with the AAAE in thinking through functions appropriate to each organization in terms of mutually reduced financial circumstances, existing clienteles, and historical areas of expertise and experience.

First Talk of Merger

When the report of the committee was presented at the Denver conference, it was acknowledged that "consideration" had been given to the possibility of organizing one national body to further the program of adult education. Following discussion of the report "it was moved by Mr. Maaske ... that the Department of Adult Education authorize the president to appoint a committee of not more than four members to enter into negotiations with a similar committee from the American Association for Adult Education looking toward a merger of the two organizations, provided that the Association is similarly interested in such a merger; the negotiations to include such matters as defining the purpose of the organization which would result from the merger, agreeing upon a new name, planning for a single publication, determining membership fees, and other matters pertinent to such a union of agencies in the field of adult education."[19]

Within two months, Sheats reported these actions to the NEA's Executive committee. On September 19, 1942 he sought, and secured approval of two requests. The first, "authorization to join with the American Association for Adult Education in the publication of a single periodical representing both organizations." Second, "authorization to hold the annual business meeting of the Department at a time other than the annual meeting of the National Education Association provided the Department continued to hold program meetings at the time of the NEA convention."[21]

The Joint Committee met in Washington on February 10, 1943, eight months after the Department had suggested that the possibility of merger be explored. The AAAE was represented by Lyman Bryson, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University and to be elected president of AAAE the following year; Eleanor Coit, a member of AAAE's Executive Board and director of the American Labor Education Service; Austin McCormack, president of AAAE and executive director of the Osborne Association, a privately financed group concerned with correctional education; and Morse Cartwright. The Department was represented by Maude Aiton; C.O. Houle; G.L. Maxwell; Clarence Spain, supervisor of adult education for the Virginia State Board of Education; and Paul Sheats.

The committee did not report back plans for a merger of the two organizations but did recommend "a plan for close cooperation."[21] It included provisions for eventual joint publication of a periodical, jointly sponsored regional meetings, joint membership campaigns, and, once wartime transportation restrictions were removed, a joint national conference. The committee's recommendations were, as could be expected since they originated within the Department, unanimously approved within a few weeks by the Department's Executive Committee. When the AAAE Executive Board met in New York City the following month to consider the recommendations, Paul Sheats was present. He gave his assurance that not only had plans for a joint publication been approved by the NEA Executive Committee but that "it is possible for the Department to meet at other times and places than in connection with the annual gathering of the NEA itself or the February meeting of the American Association of School Administrators."[21] The AAAE Executive Board approved only plans for a joint meeting following the conclusion of World War II.

As the future would eventually disclose, plans for merger did not materialize and it would be eight years, October 1950, before the two periodicals would be briefly issued as a single publication. Incredibly, it would be six years before another meeting of the department's general membership would be held. Because of travel restrictions, the Department scheduled no membership meetings in 1943-44-45, with the exception of a business meeting held in conjunction with an NEA meeting. This was at Pittsburgh in July 1943 when only the NEA Delegate Assembly met. In 1946 a separate conference of state directors was held. In 1947 the state directors and local directors met in separate, back-to-back conferences at a shared conference site. One joint meeting was held which was limited to hearing reports and recommendations from the two conferences. No official business was transacted.

The 1948 conference was a story in itself (see Chapter VII) and again, no parliamentary action was taken on the many recommendations submitted by the various committees, clinics, and occupational groups. The first formal business meeting recorded in any of the conference reports is the one held in Detroit in 1947 at the time of the joint national conference of six adult education organizations.

The net effect of moving the Business Meeting away from the NEA summer conference and discontinuing the winter meeting held in conjunction with the annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) was to weaken communication links between the department and the NEA

Legislative Commission, independent organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the many other organizations of school people that clustered around NEA or AASA meetings. This was true even though the department's offices were in the NEA headquarters building which also housed the offices of the other departments and some independent groups.

The absence of membership meetings over a five year period, the swift emergence of the National Training Laboratories as a major preoccupation of Bradford, and continued political sparing with the AAAE all but isolated the Department from the organizational strength of the NEA that had served the Department so well in the past. Most serious, it inhibited the ability of the Department's membership to find its true voice.

It would be 1952 before a Phoenix would arise from the ashes of the Department and begin to rebuild and strengthen alliances with NEA and other departments.

Chapter VI

REFERENCES

1. Wiese, Mildred J. "Conferences for the Education of Teachers. Adult Education Bulletin. 3: 20-22, October 1938.

2. Adult Education Bulletin. 4:42. January 1940.

3. Ibid, 4:149. June 1941.

4. Ely, Mary. "The Journal of Adult Education." Interstate Bulletin. 4:31, March - April 1929.

5. Cartwright, Morse A. "The Public School and the Adult Education Movement." Interstate Bulletin 3:3-4, July-August, 1928.

6. Cartwright, Morse A. "Annual Report." Journal of Adult Education. 1933.

7. NEA Proceedings, 1926, p. 368-377.

8. "Constitution of the Department." Adult Education Bulletin. 3:25-26, October 1938.

9. NEA Proceedings. 1939, p. 200-203.

10. Aiton, Maud A. "Report of the President of the Department." Adult Education Bulletin. 3: 34-35. October 1938.

11. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History, 1947-1970. Bethel Me. 1974. p. 25.

12. Ibid. p. 27.

13. Sheats, Paul H. "Now is the Time." Adult Education Bulletin. 4: 9-12, October 1939.

14. Bradford Leland P. "A Call for National Leadership." Adult Education Bulletin. 6: 35-36. December 1941.

15. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History, 1947-1970. Bethel Me. 1974. p. 32.

16. NEA Proceedings. 1942. p. 153.

17. Ibid. p. 154.

18. Ibid. p. 156-157.

19. Ibid. p. 157.

20. NEA Proceedings. 1943. p. 217.

21. National Cooperation in Adult Education." Adult Education Journal. 2: 66-72. January 1943.

Chapter VII

ADVENT OF THE WORK CONFERENCE

In his highly readable history of adult education during the depression years, Ronald Hilton describes the Department of Immigrant Education as a "new and innovative Department of the NEA."[1] He introduces this personal assessment after having observed that in "many works written about adult education in the 1950's, one catches a glimpse of an incredible fervor surrounding that array of activities." On one occasion he shared this thought with Paul Sheats who elaborated further. "I think [it important] to see this in the historical perspective.... You remember that the first adult education national organization was the Department of Adult Education of the NEA, and we forget there was a fantastic amount of evangelical devotion to this. The writings of ... L.R. Alderman in the U.S. Office of Education and later president of the Department of Adult Education ... were more like a sermon, an exhortation, to join the church.... I'm sure that what happened in the thirties was influenced by what was done under the Immigration and Naturalization Service."[1]

Sheats thus links together three forces, all working together for the good of the immigrant: the educational efforts of the Federal Bureau of Naturalization, the Office of the Specialist of Adult Education in the Federal Bureau of Education, and the NEA Department of Education.

The Department survived the Great Depression in the 1930's and, with some help from the then more affluent American Association for Adult Education (AAAE), maintained a regular publication schedule. After three years of self-imposed exile in the narrow field of immigrant education, the leadership in 1924 had the foresight to change the name to make use of a more inclusive term only then coming into common parlance, the Department of Adult Education. By 1927, Grattan reports, quoting Knowles, "the outlook had broadened sufficiently to enable the department to declare that its objective was to instruct adults from beginning English classes of evening high school and general evening classes in all public auspices." As Grattan notes, "within this framework all subsequent growth took place."[2]

In 1940, the Department broadened its governance pattern by creating a network of elected regional vice-presidents. In 1949, the regional vice-presidents became members of the Executive Committee. It was in 1945, however, that the most significant change in the history of the Department took place. It was then that Leland P. Bradford was employed by the NEA as the director of an administrative unit called the Division of Adult Education Service. Two months after assuming his new position, the Executive Committee of the Department named him executive secretary. From that day forward, the Department's program turned in a new direction, brought about in part by Bradford's taking control of the Department's annual meetings.

At the time he was named executive secretary, the Department's officers developed a job description (see Chapter VIII). The duties of the director of the Division, however, were never defined by NEA beyond an initial assignment to attend to the problems of veterans education. Nor was it ever thought necessary by either NEA or the Department to develop criteria to determine which program decisions would be directed up the NEA governance ladder and which ones would be directed toward the Department's Executive Committee. That this represented an innovative administrative arrangement is impossible to deny. It was a means of making available staff services to a cohesive occupational group within the NEA's membership that was too small to employ its own staff as well as a guarantee against bureaucratic interference from NEA top management. It was also an arrangement that had precedent and that had worked. In 1907 a Division of Rural Education had been created to serve those individuals who belonged to an affiliated Department of Rural Education. In 1945 the Division of Audiovisual Service was created to provide headquarters staff for the membership of the Department of Audiovisual Education.

While these kinds of arrangements speak volumes in terms of the trust and confidence of the NEA in middle management, they leave something to be desired in the area of accountability. For Bradford it was a situation he found much to his liking. He gives high marks not only to the NEA but to his previous employers; the WPA, the Federal Security Agency, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service for having "given (him) sufficient freedom to try new methods and make them work."[3] With his dual assignment as director of the Division and secretary of the Department he was able to use whichever authority suited him best in accomplishing his objective.

At the beginning of his assignment as head of the Division he set out, in the words of the NEA Executive Committee, to address the "immediate problem"[4] of veterans education. Or, as seen from Bradford's perspective, "when I went to the NEA I saw the first task should be directed toward Veterans Education. Thoughts I had about lessening the competition of the two associations on the national front, the Department, of which I was secretary, and the AAAE ... were put aside temporarily."[5] (As both earlier and later events indicate, "lessening", by means of "preempting" appears to be what he had in mind.)

Conferences on Veterans Education

Bradford's response to NEA's need to get a handle on veterans education was prompt and effective. Working with Kenneth Benne, the two planned a highly successful work conference, held in Cleveland, within three months of Bradford's employment. He describes the background of the conference as follows:

> ... on the basis of Kurt Lewin's food-habit studies and my own long experience with small groups being helped to find solutions to their problems with the hope of application, I felt that what was needed was a large national conference.... I secured Ken's interest, because our belief's were similar, and we planned what was to become the WORK CONFERENCE model....* I sent out hundreds of invitations and 200 participants came from approximately 40 states, and representing state departments of education, city school systems, universities, university extension divisions, rural education, government agencies, and veteran associations."[5]

Fourteen group leaders, and an equal number of recorders were selected in advance and brought to the conference site a day early for instruction either on how to record (essentially on "how to listen"[5]) and how to facilitate productive group problem solving. There were frequent exchanges of information between the work groups. Willard Givens, executive secretary of the NEA who attended, was "amazed and pleased with the intensity of work and colleagueship of spirit the conference produced."[6]

---

*A listing of the Work Conferences sponsored by the Department appears on pages 136-137.

Work Conferences
of the
NEA Department of Adult Education

1. First Veterans Education Conference. Cleveland, Ohio. January 17-19, 1946.
2. Joint National Conference of Five National Associations. Detroit, Michigan. April 23-26, 1946. (The NEA Department of Adult Education was one of the five and shared in the planning.) (Not a true work conference. See text.)
3. New England Conference on Adult and Veterans Education. May 1-3, 1946. Swampscott, Massachusetts.
4. First National Conference for State Directors of Adult Education. West Point, N.Y. September 25-28, 1946.
5. Second Veterans Education Conference. Detroit, Michigan. January 14-17, 1947.
6. First National Conference of Community Directors of Adult Education and the Second National Conference of State Directors of Adult Education. Dowling, Michigan. September 22-26, 1947.

7. National Conference on Adult Education including the Second National Conference of Community Directors and the Third National Conference of State Directors of Adult Education. Purdue University. Lafayette, Indiana. October 27-29, 1948.

8. A Conference to Plan a Conference. Chicago, Illinois. April 25-26, 1949.

9. 1949 Conference of the Department of Adult Education. Cleveland, Ohio. October 24-26,1949.

10. Sarah Lawrence Conference (to develop an organizational plan for a new organization). Bronxville, N.Y. August 4-9, 1950.

11. 1950 Conference of the Department of Adult Education. Chicago, Illinois. October 18, 1950.

12. National Assembly of Adult Educators. (The "Founding Assembly.") Columbus, Ohio. May 13-15, 1950. (Planned and managed by a highly representative, thirty member, National Organizing Committee).

Note: Proceedings of all conferences except #2, 8, 10, 12 are to be found in NEA Archives. Programs for 2 and 12 may be consulted in the George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University. A description of # 8 is provided in the June, 1949 issue of the Adult Education Bulletin and # 10 in Adult Education 1:5-12. October 1950.

One product of the conference was the formation of a Veterans Education Council lodged under the wing of the Department. This replaced the National Advisory Council on Veterans Education originally authorized by the NEA Executive Committee. Many of those most directly involved in facilitating veterans education within the public schools were already members of the Department and they welcomed the prospect of direct access to NEA's many resources, including legislative and research services.

A second product was Bradford's decision to add a "Veterans Education Supplement" to the _Adult Education Bulletin_ to carry articles and news of veterans education. The third product was the publication of the reports of sixteen committees that not only identified problems, but provided guidance in working through to solutions.[7] The consolidated report was distributed widely and reprinted several times. A similar, and equally successful conference was held in Detroit the following year.

Important as were the substantive accomplishments of these two conferences, it is difficult not to conclude that Bradford's greater interest was in what he and Benne had learned about the work conference model. Three months after the first Veterans Conference, April 22-26, 1946, a Joint National conference of five national adult education organizations was held in Detroit. There is no evidence Bradford saw the meeting as an opportunity to work on inter-organizational cooperation. Instead he identifies it as "practice"[8] opportunity for planning future work conferences and promoting topics relating to group functioning. He acknowledges that:

> ...representing only one of the five, I was unable to convince others to make it a real work conference, but it did succeed in getting a number of discussion groups into the conference. Ron [Lippitt] and I demonstrated role playing before a large group as a new technique for adult education, with Ken Benne and Chick Hendry* serving as resource persons. Ron Lippitt and Chick Hendry led a discussion group on Community Group Tensions, while Ken and I led a group on Leadership Training. Alvin Zander served as a resource person in a discussion group on Adult Education and Social Change."

---

*Charles (Chick) Hendry was coordinator of research, Commission on Community Relations, of the American Jewish Congress. Alvin Zander was at Springfield College and soon to become a member of the staff of the Research Center for Group Dynamics when it relocated at the Univeristy of Michigan after it moved from the Institute of Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The Department held a Membership Luncheon and a Business Meeting presided over by the Department's president, Robin J. Maaske, president of Eastern Oregon College of Education. Two of the thirteen conference groups which met for an hour and a quarter three times during the conference were on topics specific to the work of adult educators employed by the public schools.

Conferences for State and Local Directors

Two other well attended, well received work conferences were organized for the membership of the Department and held under its auspices. One was the First National Conference for State Directors of Adult education, held at West Point, September 25-28, 1946. The second, one year later, September 22-26, 1947, a joint meeting described as the First National Conference of Community Directors of Adult Education and the Second National Conference of State Directors of Adult Education. This assembly was convened at the Kellogg conference facility in Dowling, Michigan. The work conference design as developed by Bradford and his associates, when used to assist state and local directors work on their own programmatic problems, did much to facilitate a reality-based attack on the never-ending quest of the members of the Department for improved and more meaningful service to their various clienteles.

The Purdue Conference

A major outcome of the work conferences organized so far, as well as a carry-over from the joint meeting of the five national organizations, was the emergence of an ambitious plan, largely of Bradford's making but supported by Thomas Van Sant of the Baltimore Public Schools and at that time president of the Department, to hold a "National Conference on Adult Education"[9] at Purdue University on October 27-29, 1948. It was a meeting designed to reach far beyond the department's membership. As announced in the Bulletin, the conference would include "The Second National Conference of Community [local] Directors of Adult Education and the Third National Conference of State Directors of Adult Education." No reference was made to a Third Veterans Education Conference.

In addition to serving its own members, workers in general extension, agricultural extension, and family life education were invited to participate. The announcement of the conference that appeared in the August Bulletin advertised it as an "important experiment combining the work conference and the training conference," the latter consisting of the "analysis and practice of skills of group leadership and leadership training."[9] That a Third National Veterans Education Conference was not also announced was not because the need for one did not exist or that the reason for holding such a meeting was unclear. It, along with a full-scaled conference for community and state directors similar to those held in previous years, was preempted in large part by the experiment Bradford described.

A planning committee for the conference had been appointed which "canvassed the members of the Department ... for suggestions and recommendations as to the content and structure of the meeting."[10] Its membership of 14, however, consisted of five practicing adult educators in the public schools, one of whom worked in veterans education; three were predominately identified with the National Training Laboratories; Bradford and I accounted for two; and the remainder represented the university extension and family life interests. Kenneth Benne was the chair of the planning committee.

"With the beginning of the conference itself, a steering committee took over the actual administration of the sessions. It worked through a number of committees. The chairman of each committee ... constituted the Steering Committee."[10] The two most active committees were the Curriculum Committee, chaired by Bradford, and the Communications Committee co-chaired by Othanel "Bunny" Smith, a professor of education at the University of Illinois, and me. The other three committees were Recreation, Exhibits, and Registration and Counseling:

A summary of the conference is provided by Bradford.

> The story of 1948 would still not be complete without mentioning the somewhat disastrous conference held in October of that year. Labeled the "1948 Fall Conference of the Department of Adult Education Service (*sic*) of the National Education Association," it attempted at the urging of Thomas Van Sant, director of adult education in Baltimore and president in 1948 of the NEA Department of Adult Education Service (*sic*), to conduct T-Groups as part of the four-day conference. Tom had been a delegate at Bethel in 1947, and had successfully led the Baltimore Work Survey Conference in 1947. Most of the staff at the previous Bethel Labs served as BST-Group leaders. (Basic Skill Training), called at Purdue merely "Morning Groups." The leaders were: Ken Benne, Lee Bradford, Jack French, Max Goodson, Ron Lippitt, Paul Sheats, Herb Thelen, and Al Zander among others. It was clear very early that the conference participants were unprepared for such training, felt imposed upon, as they were. The concept of such training was too new for adult educators as a group. The Work Conference concept had been sufficiently a radical departure that they could accept. I think there is little doubt that the Purdue Conference was one of our biggest

mistakes, and one which made the laboratory method unacceptable to adult educators for many years. However, it did bring Jack Gibb into the network of NTL.

Malcolm Knowles had his first experience with lab training at Purdue, and this was important when the Adult Education Association was formed."[11]

The T-Group

What is a Basic Skill Training Group, renamed one year later as the T(raining)-Group?

A book published in 1964, T-Group Training and the Laboratory Method, is nearly 500 pages long. Consequently, several sentences, even if written by the editors may do the concept a disservice. Be that as it may, in the Preface the editors jointly define the T-Group:

> It is a method of learning ... in which ... members have the opportunity to learn about themselves, about interpersonal relations, about groups, and about larger social systems. Trainers help to establish processes of data collection, data analysis, and diagnoses of the changing here-and-now experience of the group and its members.... The T-Group and the laboratory constitute serious attempts to utilize the findings and methodologies of the behavioral sciences in inducing and reinforcing behavioral changes.[12]

To this it should be added that while the T-Group has a "trainer" as described above, it must create its own agenda and its own structure. A staff member, identified as a "group observer" is present to draw attention to social and psychological phenomenon taking place within the group.

As Bradford correctly notes, the participants at the Purdue conference were unprepared for such training--and those who planned the conference were unready to receive the participants. The conference report states that "provisions for guidance, counseling, and orientation of registrants was a last minute addition to the planning."[13]

What Went Wrong at Purdue

Although I was present at Purdue, an import from Cincinnati as an assistant on the communications staff to "Bunny" Smith, it was several years before I could fully understand what went wrong at the Department's 1948 conference. While I knew there was frustration and anger present, I could only see then that it represented rigidity on the part of many participants--not errors of judgement on the part of the leadership. The problem was not that the training was too new for adult educators, but that they had arrived expecting to work on problems of their own and were instead immediately emersed in a general session preparing them to participate in a T-group.

Substantial evaluation data is available and more than 14 pages of the 70 page conference report are devoted to its analysis. A careful reading does not reflect widespread dissatisfaction with group training _per se_. Rather it is with its imposition at this time and place. Two quotations illustrate the different tracks on which staff and many of the delegates were traveling. The final sentence of the evaluation section reads, "the greatest need for conference planning in the future as indicated in these evaluations is to find better ways of representing the purpose to the delegates and probably to develop social inventions which will help the delegates see how the set-up enables them to meet their own expressed needs insofar as they are aware of them"[14] In other words, from the perspective of staff, the question was how to improve techniques for imposing structure and content. Many of the participants felt the shoe was on the other foot: that they should not have been required to fit "into the pre-formed conference structure as distinguished from regarding the pre-planned conference structure as a broad tentative framework within which modifications could be wrought in terms of revealed needs."[15]

Although the evaluation data were not broken out into the perceptions of the various occupational groups, it is probable that those registering the least dissatisfaction were participants from family life education and from general and agricultural extension. They held membership in their own associations where they could work together with like-minded individuals on commonly shared problems. It was the abridgement of that opportunity that most disturbed the public school delegates. The evaluation data indicate that the public school people had no objection to inviting in the members of other occupational groups. They did object to having time shaved from their conference to work on someone else's agenda. The tragedy of the Purdue Conference is not that it "made the laboratory method unacceptable to adult educators for many years" but that it took from three to five years for the leaders of public school centered adult education to regroup and move ahead on the problems that held significance for them in conferences of their own making.

The Demise of the Veterans Education Program

A principal causality of the Purdue Conference was the very program the Division of Adult Education had been set up to serve --the education of returning servicemen. The individual elected to chair the Veterans Education Council at the time it was organized was Lt. Col. Robert Owens, formerly with the Selective Service System and who had been employed by the Cleveland Public

Schools as director of veterans education. In an article appearing in the Adult Education Bulletin in June 1948, he refers to the Cleveland work conference as an "exhilarating"[16] experience and expresses equal enthusiasm for the second conference held in early 1947.

In November of 1946, a poll was taken of the Council's membership. "Eighty-one percent of the members thought the Council should become a committee of the Department with definite functions.... Ninety-four percent thought there were certain things remaining to be done which would be of service to veterans, and at the time be a contribution to education, particularly adult education."[17] Following the tabulation of the poll:

> ... a joint meeting between several officers of the Council and the Department of Adult Education was held to consider how the work should be carried forward in response to the mandate. Following that meeting, all members of the Council were asked to indicate their willingness and availability to help appraise the lessons learned in veterans education and training programs. It is now planned that the evaluation studies will form the basis of a working conference to be held at the same time in the fall as the annual meeting of the Department.[17]

The anticipated annual meeting became the National Conference on Adult Education being readied for Purdue University.

However, at Purdue, the Veterans Education Committee, as it was now called, rather than holding a "working conference", met on two afternoons and two evenings. In this respect it was favored more than the state directors, local directors, and the other three occupational groups whose meetings were limited to two evening sessions, one somewhat shortened by scheduled regional meetings where, while attendance was voluntary, it did cut into other meetings scheduled for that night.

In the time available, those attending the meeting of the Veterans Education Committee could only listen to the reports of the sub-committees that had been appointed to study various aspects of the planned evaluation. The group was unable to devote the time that had been anticipated to making "recommendations relative to veterans problems remaining to be solved, and recommendations relative to adult education of the things learned in veterans education and training programs."[17] The principal recommendation to come out of the Purdue meeting of the Committee was that the "evaluation studies on the progress of veterans ... be continued ... and that four sub-committees be created to work in the ... areas of ... higher education ..., secondary schools, trade schools ... and schools at sub-secondary levels."[18]

There is no record of how the sub-committees progressed during the next twelve months, but at the 1949 conference of the Department, held in Cleveland, the committee expressed the need for a "focal point" which would ... "speak for established educational agencies below the collegiate level"[19] in the problem areas the committee identified. By the time the conference report was published the following additional information had been provided. "The assistance of the Department of Adult Education was sought, and the officials of the N.E.A. were contacted subsequently to the Department's conference and were asked whether the N.E.A. could furnish the services considered necessary."[19] Apparently Mr. Owens received no offers of help and, although I had joined the staff of the Division as assistant director on March 7, 1949, I was not asked to provide staff assistance to the committee.

The 1949 Conference

The 1949 Conference was preceded by a "Conference to Plan a Conference", held in Chicago. Prior to this meeting an analysis had been made "by the Department's officers and staff of the evaluations and reactions of the conference held at Purdue University."[20] This was followed by sending an "Interest

Checklist ... to four thousand adult educators to secure their thinking on the present practical needs in adult education."

The 1949 conference represented a partial recovery from the meeting in Purdue. It was a "work conference" in the full sense of the word and one day in advance of the opening session leaders, observers, and recorders were given an opportunity to practice the roles they were to perform during the conference. The "heterogeneous" groups worked on such common problems as community organization and adult education, how the adult educator can serve as a consultant to community groups, increasing financial support for adult education, and the training of personnel.[21] Although these appear to have been found quite useful by the public school adult educators, the state directors petitioned that at the 1950 and subsequent conferences they be scheduled "to meet as a group fifty percent of the time" and asked that the "general planning committee ... invite the chairman of the State Directors Conference Committee to sit with the planning committee."[22]

The local directors also wanted more time for the meetings than allotted and politely added, "while present and past emphasis on the group process has been valuable to this group ... there will be greater value ... in having less emphasis placed upon the process."[23] The local directors also recommended that "strong action" be taken toward unification of the two national groups in the adult education field. The Department's Executive Committee readily responded by authorizing that a committee be appointed "to explore cooperative relationships with the American Association for Adult Education"[24]

There is no reason for not thinking the strength of the local directors' eagerness to begin a cooperative relationship with the AEA was governed, at least in part, by the hope they would have a greater voice in whatever new organization might be formed than they considered themselves to have in the Department.

The 1950 Conference

The 1950 conference was again divided into general sessions, heterogeneous groups called "clinics", and occupational groupings. The clinics dealt with such topics as inservice training, program evaluation, the study of group behavior, consultant skills, and similar topics. Four of the six clinics were staffed by graduate students from the Human Dynamics Laboratory at the University of Chicago who, with several practitioners, served as a leadership team. Herbert Thelen, director of the Laboratory, reported that, "in general, the Laboratory feels that the concept of team leadership which it set out to study ... is a promising notion well worth further experimentation." Although the delegates were still being experimented upon, those who conducted the experiment did not lose sight of the expressed need of those in their groups to take home specific, job-related skills and knowledge.

Homer Kempfer, specialist for General Adult Education in the U.S. Office of Education was chair of the evaluation committee. His overall conclusion was that "examination of available evidence shows that, on the whole and in most of the details, the conference was a definite success." He acknowledges that there were "dissatisfied customers" and goes on to say:

> How many others failed to attend because of the nature, structure, leadership, or content of the conference, and past experience with Department of Adult Education conferences, of course, were questions which this evaluation can not answer. They are questions which should not be forgotten however.[26]

He also reported that the data would support the conclusion that "the meeting at which the new national organization was discussed was too long and dull--a conference low point."[27]

The Veterans Education Committee did not meet. By this time it had decided to cast its lot with the American Council on Education.

By 1951 the Department of Adult Education was no more. It ordered its own demise and the members, along with those of the

AAAE, pooled their resources to form the Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA). The work conference model however lived on in the conferences and Board meetings of the AEA and the National Association for Public School Adult Educators (also destined to become an NEA Department) and, eventually, in the NEA's leadership training programs.

From their origin in 1946 and 1947 until the present time, pre-conference orientation sessions for conference leadership, "buzz-groups" (originally introduced by Donald Phillips of Michigan State University), intra-group recording and inter-group communication designs, techniques for dealing with the "hidden agenda", and other imaginative innovations invented by Bradford and his colleagues have helped raise the level of productivity of countless small and large group meetings. It was the linking of useful, innovative meeting devices with a compulsory short course in the dynamics of group behavior that doomed the Purdue conference.

The deliberate effort at Purdue and subsequent conferences to attract a significant segment of other occupational groups to the Department's conferences was designed not only as a way of promoting a methodological concept, but of introducing a wholly new purpose for national professional conferences. Also, ignoring any opportunity this might have presented for work with the AAAE, the work conference far from "lessening competition between the AAAE and the Department," one of Bradford's announced intents when he became director of the Division, became one more competing activity and helped hasten the radical restructuring of the adult education movement that took place at the national level in the early fifties.

Chapter VII

REFERENCES

1. Hilton, Ronald. The Short Happy Life Of A Learning Society: Adult Education In America, 1930-39. Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1981. p. 107.

2. Grattan, Hartley C. In Quest of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Adult Education. New York: Associated Press, 1955. p. 226.

3. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History: 1947-1970. Bethel Me., p. 27.

4. NEA Proceedings, 1945-46, p. 292.

5. Bradford. op.cit. p. 31.

6. Ibid. p. 32.

7. National Work Conference on Veterans Education. Washington. D.C.: NEA Department of Adult Education, 1946. 60 p. (NEA Archives. Box 210 SU).

8. Bradford. op.cit. p. 32.

9. "Announcing a National Conference on Adult Education. "Adult Education Bulletin." 12:4, p. 163. August, 1948.

10. "1948 Fall Conference. Report and Proceedings." Washington, D.C.: NEA Department of Adult Education. (NEA Archives. Box 210 M) p. 1.

11. Bradford. op. cit. p. 57.

12. Bradford, Leland P., Jack R. Gibb, Kenneth D. Benne. T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: Innovation in Re-education. N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, 1964. p. viii.

13. "1948 Fall Conference." op. cit. p. 45.

14. Ibid. p. 67.

15. Ibid. p. 61-62.

16. Owens, Robert H. "Transition of Veterans Education Council". Adult Education Bulletin. 12:4, p. 109. April, 1948.

17. Ibid. p. 110.

18. "1948 Fall Conference." op. cit. p. 5.

19. 1949 Conference of The Department of Adult Education. Washington, D.C.: NEA Department of Adult Education. 1949. p. 22. (NEA Archives. Box 210).

20. Ibid. p. 1.

21. Ibid. pp. 2-3.

22. Ibid. p. 18.

23. Ibid. pp. 15-16.

24. Ibid. p. 28.

25. "1950 Adult education Conference." Washington, D.C.: NEA Department of Adult Education. 1950. p. 49 (NEA Archives. Box 210).

26. Ibid. p. 51.

27. Ibid. p. 49.

Chapter VIII

ISSUES AND CONSEQUENCES 1942 - 1951

Malcolm Knowles[1] has well described the events that took place between the summer of 1942 when the Department's members authorized negotiations to begin with the AAAE "looking toward a merger of the two organizations"[2] and May 1951, when both organizations agreed to disband. During those nine years the concept of "merger" gave way to "cooperation"[3] and finally to a discussion of a more "fully integrated adult education profession."[4]

Although the sequence of each event has been recorded, the question has yet to be explored: Why did it take eight years to resolve this organizational dispute; a resolution ultimately made possible only by the demise of both organizations? For its part, the AAAE had long advocated cooperation between and among agencies in adult education at local, state, regional, and national levels. It had been particularly active in advancing the concept of Adult Education Councils, a device used with a large measure of success in encouraging cooperative planning among adult education agencies at the local level.[5] Paul Sheats, the president of the Department when the first meeting of a joint AAAE/Department committee was convened, was a reasonable person and his devotion to forwarding the cause of adult education was beyond question. Leland Bradford, who would succeed Sheats as principal negotiator for the Department, began perfecting the procedures of the Work Conference in 1946, and, with the launching of the first National Training Laboratory in Group Development (NTL) one year later, was rapidly building a reputation as a leading expert in group behavior, one aspect of which was an examination of the problem-solving and decision-making processes.

With this background of successful experience and technical knowledge brought to both sides of the negotiating table, it could be assumed that the forces of solving jurisdictional problems need not have been so drawn out. One explanation is found in Knowles' observation that "what the NEA Department perceived as overtures of cooperation, the AAAE leadership apparently perceived as threats of annexation."[6] A close examination of the evidence, read in the context of organizational history prior to 1941--and a knowledge of subsequent events--suggests that AAAE leadership had good reason to cling to this point of view.

The Overlapping Membership Issue

A recurring reason for misunderstanding was the visibility the Department brought to an alleged overlapping of memberships. In the minutes of the initial meeting of the AAAE/Department negotiating committee in February 1943, of which Paul Sheats served as secretary, he records that one of the recommendations of the group was that the two organizations would "jointly plan a membership campaign which would eliminate the overlapping and duplication of effort and, in some instances, unfortunate competition now existent."[7] Yet in the same report he also states that, as of the date of the meeting, "the organizations are almost equal in size--the Association reporting 2,018 members; ... the NEA Department 2,173 members ... of which only 179 hold membership in both organizations." He added that "while the NEA in the past has drawn its support primarily from public education groups; the recent termination of the WPA Adult Education Program has meant ... the Department [has] filled in the ranks by direct and successful appeals to librarians, settlement workers, extension teachers, and lay leaders."

The word "successful" can be questioned. In 1939 the Department's membership had reached a high of 3,301. In 1941 the total was stated as "approximately 2,000".[8] The reported membership of 2,173 at the time of the Joint Committee meeting in early 1943 shows a gain of only 173 members in the two years that had elapsed since 1941, a figure still more than a thousand short of the high tide of membership in 1939. If president Sheats' concern about overlapping membership was that AAAE would not be able to compete on even terms, it was a worry better spent on the Department.

Even as the Joint Committee met in 1943, the Department was far from having filled in the ranks with new members from outside the public education group. It was still seeking them. In the October 1943 issue of the Bulletin, Sheats addressed an urgent appeal to those members of the Department "who think that it is important that there should be, in this country, a strong professional organization to promote adult education [and] which finds its system of popular, grass roots [support in] member control."[9] To this audience he let it be known that the Department "must have 750 new members by December 1 if we are to close our books for the year without exhausting our supply of red ink."

Seven years later the ranks were still to be filled in. At that time (1950), in a discussion with Paul Sheats and Herbert Hunsaker, dean of Western Reserve's Cleveland College, Bradford recalls Hunsaker expressing the opinion "the two associations could never come together because the Department of Adult Service [sic.] was largely made up of public school adult educators while the American Association had a broader membership."[10]

One individual who was not convinced that the Department would greatly expand its membership beyond its basic public school audience was Morse Cartwright, executive director of the AAAE. In 1944, in response to a more limited proposal for joint programming than had been extended by the Department in 1943, he replied that after "careful consideration on the part of the Executive Board, the Association again declined to link itself with any special form of adult education--in this case, public school adult education."[11]

The Competing Services Issue

The more direct reason for concern on the part of the AAAE was the apprehension that the Department's aspiration was to take over functions the AAAE considered its own. Since its founding in 1926 the AAAE, despite its unabashed championship of liberal adult education (although it did not use that catch-all term to cover its program) was generally considered the pivot of all organized educational activities for adults. In addition, through its conferences and publications, it endeavored to serve as a clearing house for the kinds of information it deemed useful to all adult educators.

There can be little doubt that the leadership of the Department considered the AAAE's performance in these roles inadequate and was progressively planning either to assume them for itself or, if that was impossible, to be in a position to influence them through some kind of organizational kinship.

As noted earlier, Bradford's 1941 article, "A Call for National Leadership,"[13] and T.H. Shelby's address at the 1942 winter meeting of the Department, both made reference to the need for a "representative national adult education organization." Shelby added the word "democratic" to his specifications.[13]

In a one-page editorial in the December 1943 issue of the Bulletin, Bradford twice reminded his readers that direction finding must come from the field and not be "imposed by some exalted national group upon the rest of us."[14] Several paragraphs later he emphasized that direction finding must grow out of the deliberations of local, state and national groups, "not plans favored by some high group meeting in isolation from the field and its problems."

The Democratic Control Issue: AAAE

The concern about the non-representative and non-democratic character of AAAE was well founded. Knowles, in that section of his book on the adult education movement devoted to the organizational structure of the AAAE, emphasizes first, the close control of the top leadership over the members and second, that "in its lifetime" the AAAE did not "discover how to involve the population of its field in carrying on its work through committees."[15]

The Department's pressure on AAAE did bring about some changes. While not abolishing the indirect election of officers by the Executive Board, a constitutional amendment passed in 1942 did provide for a three year term for members of the Council, one-third to be elected annually.* At the same time a trend began to be evident of bringing into membership on the Council individuals more likely to debate issues than to forward them on to the Executive Board or Executive Committee without discussion. Paul Sheats was elected to the 100 person Executive Council for a one-year term in 1943 and, because of the change in the Constitution, to a three year term in 1944. The members of the Council elected him to the twelve member Executive Board in 1945 and re-elected him in 1948. In 1948 Cyril Houle became a member of the Council. The writer was elected to the Executive Council in 1947 and Leland Bradford in 1948 as was Abbott Kaplan of the University of California Extension and who had delivered a stirring address at the Association's annual meeting in 1947 calling for reform and change not only within the AAAE but in the entire field of adult education. Malcolm Knowles, destined to be the first executive director of the Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA) was elected to the Council in 1947.

---

*During the business session of the 1942 Annual Meeting, Cyril Houle "asked why, under the revised constitution, the officers were to be elected by the Council rather than by the membership." The secretary of the committee replied that the committee drafting the revisions "felt that the 100 members of the Council represented the general membership" ... and that "furthermore, it had been thought advisable to keep the cost of balloting and voting ... at a minimum."[16]

In 1948 the Association made an earnest effort to design the format of its annual meeting in such a way as to "emphasize the active involvement of all individual participants,"[17] a move undoubtedly initiated by Paul Sheats. He served as chairman of the Conference Group Staff and arranged a half-day practice session for leadership teams on the afternoon before the formal opening of the meeting. By balancing a concern for content with an awareness for process, the meeting was well received.

The Democratic Control Issue: The Department

The movement within AAAE toward greater member participation, minor though it might have been considered by some, was not matched by a similar march forward within the Department. The two National Training Laboratories at Bethel, Maine in 1947[18] and 1948[19] were announced in reports to NEA members as activities sponsored by the Department. In actual fact they were planned in complete independence of the Department's Executive Committee. Similarly, much of the planning for the Department's work conferences after 1947 was, as Bradford had complained earlier was the practice of AAAE, undertaken "by some group meeting in isolation the field and its problems." Paul Sheats' call for "member control" was negated by the years of forestalled membership meetings during the time the work conference model was being developed.

Much of the organizational destabilization of the forties was also due to the open-ended nature of the Department's constitution. In 1938 the Purpose article of the Constitution of the Department (formerly referred to as By-laws) was amended to read, "The purpose of the Department of Adult Education of the National Education Association shall be to promote adult education of all kinds in the United States and to insure continuity of purpose and effort in the development of an effective national program."[20]

In this respect it did not differ greatly from the AAAE's statement of purpose which read, "its object shall be to promote the development and improvement of adult education in the United States ... [and to] provide for the gathering and dissemination of information concerning the aims and methods of adult education."[21]

The Issue of Intent

What did differ was the interpretation given these words by those who originally voted for their adoption and then, later, by those who used them to justify a different set of objectives. The dream of the founders of AAAE was for an ever increasing level of political, social, and cultural enlightenment on the part of American and world citizenry. The target of their endeavors was the already nominally well educated adult. For William C. Smith, Robert Deming, Wil Lou Gray, Marguerite Burnett and other founders of the Departments of Immigrant and Adult Education, the term "adult education" meant Americanization and citizenship education, elementary education--later to be known as Adult Basic Education--and literacy education.

By 1940 both organizations had broadened the scope of their activities but each one, in publications and conference programming, represented distinctly different points of emphasis. The Department represented the authority and resources of public education being brought to the education of adults. Its recognition of the need for public sanction and support, and the expansion of the concept of community education, made it prudent and necessary to involve a wide representation from the community in planning and sustaining the program. At the local level this was reflected in widely used advisory committees and in the employment of individuals outside the school system as instructors and group leaders in specialized areas. At the national level this meant accepting as members, in the words of the 1938 Constitutional amendment, "all who are actively engaged ... in adult education work."[22] Hindsight makes it clear that had the words "as a service of the public schools" been added, future confusion would have been avoided.

Broadening the purpose of the Department's program dated back to 1928, two years after the founding of the AAAE. In that year the membership passed a resolution calling for the association to "function as an agency for the coordination of means and the study and solution of the problems in the field of adult education."[23] The resolution was preceded by several "whereases" which noted an increased interest in adult education, an increase in services by unrelated agencies, and the need for better coordinated and articulated programs.

This resolution was followed by another which said "we reaffirm our belief in a carefully planned and sustained program and pledge our united interest and accumulated knowledge ... to achieve our objective--a literate citizenry."[23] In other words, while the Department's members sought to extend their influence in the field of literacy, there is nothing in the resolutions adopted that day to indicate they sought to extend the scope of the Department's program beyond the broad, though specialized, field of literacy, an area of adult study which, along with Americanization and citizenship, was almost universally referred to as "adult education."

The constitutional change adopted in 1938 had much the same intent, even though by that time, a decade later, adult education had taken on a broader meaning. The intent was still to articulate and coordinate programs in which the public schools were a participant. In 1938, George Mann was vice-president of the Department and had proved himself, working in California, to be one of the most effective leaders in the country in designing strategies to extend public support for adult education. His support of the 1938 amendment was part of a strategy to extend throughout the country what had already taken place in his own state. After he became president, he observed that in adult education

> ... there need be no partisanship, no competition; every development ... will further any other plan or movement in the field. The Department is attempting to furnish a leadership that is desirable and necessary with a goal to seek, which is a permanent, well-supported national and state program of adult education.[24]

Mann does not specify the procedures and personnel required to mount a successful legislative campaign for state support. However, in California it had been gained--and maintained--as a result of the lobbying efforts of the California Teachers Association and by voluntary groups whose institutional educational objectives had been advanced through participation in community advisory committees organized in local districts.

While Mann sought to constantly strengthen the community service role of the public school adult education program, he did not overlook the importance of the program which had served as the foundation of public school adult education. After the outbreak of war in Europe, he reminded members of the Department that tens of thousands of foreign-born lived in the United States and that these remained a priority target for adult education.

Although labor education was largely a program offering of the universities, there was a place for it within the local school's adult program. At the Joint National Adult Education Conference in 1946, Eleanor Coit, director of the American Labor Education Service, and an officer and long-time member of the Executive Board of the AAAE, emphasized that "schools should be a vital community agency to serve the needs of all adults in the community, including workers who are concerned with consumer problems, housing, price control, safety and many other problems."[25] If the public schools were to meet this responsibility, it was essential they call upon a variety of community resources in the planning, and frequently in the staffing, of such programs. By means of the various amendments to its constitution, the way was always open for those who might care to do so to become members of the Department.

The intent of the 1938 amendment was in no way part of a design to assume direction of the adult education field. Those parts of the total program stemming from the activities of libraries, general and agricultural extension, labor unions, group work agencies, and all other instruments of community education were safe from proselytizing by the Department.

The Department Widens Its Slope

However, after America's entrance into the war, Sheats, Bradford, and to a lesser extent, Maaske, interpreted the 1938 constitutional amendment to mean the Department was now commissioned by its members to assume the task of becoming the leading organizational voice of the adult education movement. In a report in the June 1944 Bulletin, Sheats lists losses as well as gains during his term as president. The losses included the curtailment of annual meetings during the war, the termination of the WPA program, and the failure to negotiate with the AAAE. The gains included endorsement of "proposed legislation for intellectual cooperation between the United States and other nations and the bill allocating federal funds for adult education through the extension divisions of land-grant institutions." The Department also assisted "the editors of the Phi Delta Kappa Dictionary of Education in defining adult education terms" and was represented in meetings of the "United States Liaison Committee for International Education."[26]

It is important to applaud activities of this kind. In doing so, it is equally important to indicate that they represent missions that could as well have been undertaken by the AAAE. Missing from Sheats' list of gains are any activities the Department might have been expected to undertake in securing the introduction into Congress of federal aid for community programs of adult education. Also missing were endeavors to strengthen linkages with school administrators, chief state school officers, and the state education associations. Missing was any reference to programs undertaken to meet the perennial requests of part-time teachers of adults to learn more about methods useful in instructing adults or in developing strategies for raising the hourly rate of pay for part-time instructors to a scale more nearly comparable to that of teachers in the day school.

It is true, an agenda of this magnitude could not be undertaken in the absence of a full time staff member. However, had committees been established to begin work in one or more of these areas, it is possible a clearer direction for the Department might have been set in the hope that a time would arrive when staff services might be secured.

The Status Quo and AAAE

For its part, the AAAE could have done more to fulfill its constitutional assignment of developing and improving adult education in the country. At no point did it seem willing to reappraise its long standing position opposing federal aid for general adult education. This despite its admiration of the Federal Forum Project as exemplified by Studebaker's appearances at AAAE annual meetings and his election in 1947 by the executive Board as one of the three vice-presidents. The AAAE did not energetically seek to organize a national council of adult education agencies although, in the opinion of some, "such an organization was exactly the purpose that had activated the founding of the Association in 1925-26."[27] The restricted composition of its topmost governance and the absence of any sign of deliberate speed in widening its definition of adult education conspired to isolate the Association during its fifteen years of Carnegie support from many of the main currents of adult education.

After 1942 the response of the Department, with the exception of Sheats' assistance at the time of the AAAE's 1948 meeting, was not to use positions of leadership within AAAE to change or strengthen that association. Rather it was to limit some of the program objectives useful to adult educators working in public schools and substitute programs designed to appeal to all individuals working with adults. The 1943 proposal to merge the two associations was not preceded by a survey of membership opinion in either association or by informal prior discussions with AAAE representatives as to the function of each organization appropriate to a wartime emergency or a weakened financial condition. "Defining the purposes" of the two organizations preceded all other objectives listed in Maaske's motion setting up the first meeting of the Joint Committee in 1943. However, Sheats' minutes of the meeting do not indicate that this part of the agenda was discussed.

Consequences of an Unclear Function

In 1945, following the appointment of Leland Bradford as director of NEA's Division of Adult Education Service, a two-day meeting of the Department's Executive Committee was held in Washington, D.C. on November 1 and 2. The first order of business was to elect Bradford executive secretary. The committee than discussed the functions of the secretary and "agreed" that the first function of the secretary would be to serve "ex officio as a member of the executive committee." The second function would be to "implement the decisions and policies of the executive committee."[29]

The final item on the agenda was a consideration of the objectives of the Department. While all other items appeared to have had closure, the Department's objectives were "formulated tentatively."[28] Tentative they were and tentative they remained. For the record they were (somewhat abridged):

1. Extend adult education opportunities, especially under public school auspices.
2. Foster and support national legislation for the furtherance of adult education.
3. Promote effective programs to meet the educational needs of veterans.
4. Assist in the coordinating of national, state, and local adult education associations, agencies and activities.
5. Serve as a clearing house for the exchange of information about adult education programs.
6. Aid in the professionalization of adult education, especially in relation to publicly supported and financed programs.
7. Advise and assist in the development of programs of adult education associations and councils.

That the objectives of the department were labeled "tentative" was undoubtedly at Bradford's insistence. As will be recalled from Chapter I, even as his first meeting with the Department's Executive Committee was being planned, Bradford was meeting "often at night" with Ronald Lippitt to discuss the innovative approaches to supervisory training he and Lippitt had developed while both were employed by the Federal Security Agency. It was also in November that he and Lippitt were joined by Kenneth Benne and "our [NTL] team began to form." By that fall, Bradford "knew what he wanted to be and do."[29]

This team of brilliant social scientists was but slightly interested in the day-to-day problems and opportunities, rewards and disappointments of planning, organizing, and delivering educational offerings for adults in communities across the country. Its members were greatly interested in learning-theory, organizational behavior, and the definition and role of group leadership and membership. As early as 1947 the concepts that began to be developed in late 1945 would find an institutionalized outlet in the first NTL program at Bethel, Maine.

Consequences of Unclear Goals

A different history would have been written had the objectives set by the Department's Executive Committee in November also become the agenda of the Division. Instead, Bradford's objectives for the Division were forced, to the extent possible, on the Department. If the Executive Committee's objectives, after being confirmed or amended by the Department's membership, had been presented to both NEA and AAAE governance as a statement of the Department's program for the immediate future, and had the AAAE in turn presented a set of freshly formulated objectives to the Department and to NEA, a discussion of the needs and wants of adult educators might have replaced the discussion of the needs and wants of the executive leaders of both the Department and AAAE.

Had the Department's Executive Committee exercised the authority required, and which the NEA's Executive Committee must have assumed the committee had, to monitor and enforce agreed upon objectives, it can be reasonably predicted that by the time of the 1946 National Conference on Adult Education in Detroit, the tension between AAAE and the Department either would have been resolved or, at least some time devoted to discussing questions of program overlap. It is equally possible the disastrous conference at Purdue University might have been avoided and the need for dissolving the two associations in 1951 would not have arisen.

Instead, eight months later, in the August 1946 issue of the Bulletin, after a new president of the Department had been elected, a new set of objectives, some clearly revealing the direction of Bradford's interests, had been formulated. At that time Perry L. Schneider, assistant to the director of evening schools for the New York City Board of Education announced that committees had been appointed for the purpose of:

1. Gaining closer working arrangements with the American Vocational Association.
2. Developing cooperative relationships with the American Research Association.
3. Developing legislative proposals on adult education as a pattern for states and communities.
4. Establishing a joint committee on principles, policies and practices in adult education.
5. Beginning a publication program jointly sponsored by the Department and the NEA on such subjects as discussion methods and work conferences.[30]

Those objectives which matched Bradford's aims for the Division received staff support; those which did not were allowed to wither on the vine of uncultivated volunteer initiative.

One year later, September 1947, Morse Cartwright was granted an eleven month leave of absence for health reasons by the AAAE. Glen Burch, the editor of the Adult Education Journal, was named acting director. At the February meeting of the AAAE Executive Board, Burch reported he had had several discussions with Leland Bradford who had advanced three specific suggestions for cooperation between the two organizations: (1) that there be advance agreement between the editors of the Journal and the Bulletin as to what they might carry in the way of special articles and news; (2) that the AAAE and the Department clear with each other on plans for national meetings; (3) that the AAAE join with the Department in calling a conference on research in adult education. Reasonable as this request was, "in the light of the fact that there was still no mutual agreement on the basic function of the two organizations, the [AAAE] Board decided not to take any action."[31] .

At the 1949 Annual Meeting of the AAAE, Morse Cartwright resigned as executive director of the association and was elected its president for a one-year term. Herbert Hunsaker was named as acting director and the association office was moved to Cleveland. Also meeting at the time of the AAAE Conference was the Joint Commission for the Study of Adult Education, an outcome of the 1946 conference held in Detroit. One of the Commission's recommendations was that the AAAE and the Department each appoint a committee

> ... to meet jointly to study and make recommendations regarding the establishment of a single, new, over-all adult education organization adequately representative of the entire adult education field. The committees met in

> December (1959), March and April and have operated throughout as a single group. The thinking has been so unanimous that the group considered itself as, and is here known as the Joint Committee.[32]

Of the 22 individuals appointed to the committee three were state directors, one being the durable George Mann. There were two local directors of public school programs and two representatives of agencies of the federal government. The remaining sixteen members included Bradford and myself and about an equal number of university and private agency personnel. Howard McClusky served as chair, Kenneth Benne as vice-chair.

The ultimate conclusion of the committee could have been predicted in advance. By agreeing to dismantle the AAAE, Hunsaker had nothing to lose but the added volunteer work of serving as its acting director. He also had worked long enough with Bradford to be confident he would not exert his influence to create a new and stronger Department of Adult Education under a different name. Quite the opposite would be the result. With the elevation of Cartwright to the presidency of AAAE and the removal of the administrative office to Cleveland, the ideological competition between the single-minded purposefulness of Bradford and the unending conservatism of Cartwright came to an end. In the final report submitted to both associations, and which reached members of the AAAE in advance of their 1950 meeting, the "Joint Committee unanimously agreed upon several points" the first of which was "there is imperative need for a new organization equipped to offer broad services to Adult Education."[33]

The Sarah Lawrence Workshop

As with most ideas whose time has come, the dynamics required for generating action sprang from various and complex sources. Bradford's version of the sequence of events which triggered the relatively rapid movement toward a dissolution of two existing organizations and the creation of a new organization is,

> ... as soon as I heard that Morse Cartwright had resigned and Herb [Hunsaker] had been elected [May 1949], I flew to Cleveland, and after a long day's talk we reached agreement that the solution was the formation of a new organization. We laid plans to seek reactions and, hopefully, approval from our separate Boards, and developed arrangements for a series of meetings around the country to make recommendations to culminate in a final planning workshop to be held at Sarah Lawrence College in August 1950.[34]

Bradford concludes this account of the events leading to the formation of AEA by saying, "Herb Hunsaker and I were on the Board (AEA) but one of the bargains made was that neither of us could be elected President," eventuality neither of them need have feared. In different ways both were so closely tied to the past (Hunsaker had, at one time, been a field representative for AAAE) that all of the intricate plans made at Sarah Lawrence would have fallen into disarray had either one indicated he was seeking that level of leadership in the new organization.

Knowles' more detailed account picks up the story after the first meeting of the AAAE-Department Joint Committee in December 1949. He reports that at the 1950 Annual Meeting of AAAE, the report of the Joint Committee urging that plans for "a new kind of adult education organization" be made was greeted with such enthusiasm "that the conferees urged the joint committee to expedite the work to the end that a national convocation might be held in 1951 for the purpose of achieving a new organization."[35] The Joint Committee then "hurriedly arranged for a six day conference to be held August 1950 at Sarah Lawrence College."[35] * The new organization came into being May 13-15, 1951.

---

*Of the twenty-seven participants in the conference, in addition to Bradford and myself representing the NEA Department, two local directors, but no state directors were present. Homer Kempfer of the U.S. Office of Education, and who had been employed by the Adult Education Bureau of the New York State Department of Education was also present. Howard McClusky of the University of Michigan was chair.[35]

The Crucial Question

One crucial question remains. Why did members of the Department go along with the destruction of their organization? In reporting the May 1949 meeting of the Joint Committee, Thomas A. Van Sant, director of Adult Education for the Baltimore Public Schools and, at that time, president of the Department, wrote that "during the discussion it was clearly evident that, while the representatives of specific areas of adult education recognized the need for distinct and separate organizations, they also acknowledged areas of common concern."[37] Why did those representing the Department--Van Sant, Maaske, Bradford and me--not identify public school adult education as one of the specific areas? Part of the answer may rest in the perception that the Department's members were more committed to the concept of community service than to their institutional identification. If so, it was a point of view I understood and shared.

As reported earlier, I had joined the staff of the NEA as assistant director of the Division of Adult Education Service in 1949. Although I had been elected to a two year term as a regional vice-president in 1946, I knew little about the Department and nothing of its history. Despite the claim that the Department, because of its system of regional officers and affiliated organizations was more representative of the field than AAAE, my memory is that the only duties with which I was charged were to submit newsnotes to the editor of the Bulletin and recruit members.

I enthusiastically supported the movement to replace the Department and link it with a community oriented organization such as the plans indicated the new association would be. In retrospect, I am inclined to the opinion that this point of view was shared by many members of the Department, especially those who worked part-time at the local level. Even those who did not fall into this category, full-time directors and members of the staff of state departments of education, had more experience thinking in terms of cooperation than confrontation. Based on perceptions I developed after 1951, I also think many members of the Department became bored with repeated confrontations with AAAE and finally asked themselves, "What is all the fuss about? If we can make better progress, or if our voice can be better heard by building a new organization (or absorbing ... or cooperating ... or merging ... or federating ...) let us do it quickly and get on with what we need to do."

Another factor influencing the opinions of some members, particularly those who worked full-time in adult education and had longer experience, was the intrusion of "group dynamics" into what they saw as the priority interest of the Department's staff.

By abolishing the Department they hoped they would find a new organization that would deliver a more balanced program. A case can also be made that state and local directors, the mainstay of the Department's membership, were under represented, particularly on the AAAE/Department Joint Committee in 1949-50, and at the Sarah Lawrence planning meeting. Bradford had also been quite successful in placing NTL colleagues, individuals who, however otherwise qualified, were not in tune with the Department's needs--and the aspirations of the Department's membership--while serving on Department and joint committees.

A problem the officers of the Department faced in making decisions about the organization was uncertainty as to the extent of their authority over the executive secretary. They had not hired Leland Bradford; their advice had not been sought when he was employed; and none of the funds raised by member dues went toward his salary, other staff, or the expenses of the office. With the gradual easing of the need to intelligently absorb veterans into established educational systems, the task for which he had been employed became less pressing. What should be his new job assignment?

Was he empowered to operate the Department as he saw fit? Was he to work for the Board as the Department's chief executive officer part of the time and for the NEA, on a different agenda, part of the time? Or did he, as seems most likely, consider the broad understanding he had developed with Willard Givens about a new definition of adult education under which the Division would operate, also include a grant of authority to maneuver the Department into the same understanding?

These and other questions were never brought before the NEA's Executive Committee by the officers of the Department and it was not the kind of question Bradford himself would have raised.[*] At no time had the NEA ever suggested that as the price of its support, the Department was a pawn to be moved about at will by an authorized agent of the Association. Quite the contrary. The entire philosophy and history of departmental relationships was the exact opposite. What would have been the result had the ambiguity of the relationship been faced? With so many voices to be heard, the outcome of the hypothetical question is beyond speculation.

To all of the above must be added the realization that in the forties a tradition of strong executive control marked the operations not only of labor unions and corporations, but of voluntary associations as well. Morris Fishbein, the editorial voice of the American Medical Association, Carl Milam of the

---

[*] His goal for NTL, which he initially considered an adult education activity, was always how to "gain independence from NEA but not to lose connection and help"[38]

American Library Association and Willard Givens of the NEA were dominant figures who by force of personality were largely responsible for the rapid growth of those organizations both before and after the war. Some, like Milam and Givens retired with great honor. Others, like Fishbein, eventually lost their jobs. It took more provocation then than is now required for those in lower echelons to speak out against those in authority. The democratization of voluntary associations, the rise of labor unions that gave voice to semi-skilled workers and to professionals, and the increased role of women in decision-making were still in the future.

If AEA had demonstrated early in its history that it could meet the needs of specialized groups, a successor organization to the Department would not have emerged in 1952. Despite the best of intentions--and AEA's first president, Howard McClusky of Michigan, and Malcolm Knowles the first executive director, certainly had them--meeting the full agenda of the service needs of public school adult educators would have deflected AEA from its central purpose. Its mission was to respond to the entire field and not to the entirety of any one.

Whatever reasons individual members might give for doing away with their own organization, when they voted to abolish the Department they voted to disaffiliate from the NEA, the nation's most powerful representative of, by, and for public education. It was an affiliation soon missed--and an affiliation soon to be sought again.

Chapter VIII

REFERENCES

1. Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Adult Education Movement in the United States*. N.Y. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. pp. 210-217.

2. *NEA Proceedings*, 1942. p. 157.

3. Sheats, Paul H. "A First Report on Negotiations with the AAAE." *Adult Education Bulletin* 8:111-112; April 1944.

4. "News From the Department" *Adult Education Bulletin* 13:162. August 1949.

5. Kotinsky, Ruth. *Adult Education Councils*. N.Y.: American Association for Adult Education. 1940.

6. Knowles. *op. cit*. p. 214.

7. "National Cooperation in Adult Education." *Adult Education Bulletin* 2:66-72. January 1943.

8. *Adult Education Bulletin* 5:149. June 1941.

9. Sheats, Paul H. "Fall Membership Campaign." *Adult Education Bulletin* 8:3. October 1943.

10. Bradford, Leland P. *National Training Laboratories: 1947-1970*. Bethel, Me. 1974. p. 71.

11. Cartwright, Morse A. *Annual Report of the Director, 1944-45*. pp. 10-11.

12. Bradford, Leland P. "A Call for National Leadership." *Adult Education Bulletin* 6:35-36. December 1941.

13. *NEA Proceedings*. 1942. p. 153.

14. *Adult Education Bulletin* 8:35. December 1943.

15. Knowles. *op. cit*. p. 201.

16. *Journal of Adult Education*. 1942. p. 98.

17. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 6, AAAE Annual Meeting Programs Folder. George Arents Research Library for Special Collections at Syracuse University. GARLSU

18. NEA Proceedings, 1946. p. 191.

19. NEA Proceedings, 1947. p. 283.

20. "Constitution of the Department." Adult Education Bulletin 3:25. October 1938.

21. Constitution of the American Association for Adult Education." Adult Education Journal 1:77. January 1942.

22. NEA Proceedings, 1938. p. 376.

23. NEA Proceedings, 1928. p. 303.

24. Adult Education Bulletin. 4:112. April 1940.

25. "Work Groups at the Joint National Conference." Journal of Adult Education 10:514.

26. Sheats, Paul H. "Biennial Report of the President, "1942-44." Adult Education Bulletin 8: 146-47. June 1944.

27. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 6, AAAE Executive Board, Minutes and Records folder, February 16, 1948. GARLSU.

28. Maaske, Roben. "The Department Moves Forward." Adult Education Bulletin 10:49-52. December 1945.

29. Bradford. National Training Laboratories: 1947-70. op. cit. p. 27.

30. Schneider, Perry L. "The Department of Adult education." Adult Education Bulletin 11:181. August 1946.

31. "AAAE Meeting of the Executive Board. February 16, 1948." Arents Research Library. Syracuse University. Adult Education Association Collection. Box 6.

32. "AAAE News." Adult Education Journal. July 1950. p. 102.

33. Ibid. p. 104.

34. Bradford. op. cit. p. 71.

35. Knowles. op. cit. p. 215-217.

36. "Toward a New Association." Adult Education Bulletin 1:5-12. October 1950.

37. Van Sant, Thomas A. "President's Letter." Adult Education Bulletin 13:163.

38. Bradford. op. cit. p. 168.

Chapter IX

THE NEA AND THE ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA) technically and legally was a new organization. It was founded immediately following an action by members of the NEA Department of Adult Education and the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) to disband their organizations in the hope of establishing a new and better order. At the time of the AEA's founding, the Department had been in existence for 30 years and the AAAE for 25 years.

Psychologically it was a merger of two organizations; each one bringing to the new organization its own set of members, its former staffs, and the accumulated hopes and frustrations of recent history. Financially, in addition to its earnings, it represented a federating of donated time and travel by the staff of the NEA Division of Adult Education Service and Cleveland College of Western Reserve University. Initially, office space for the Association's Central headquarters was offered by the American Library Association in Chicago. The Cooper Union in New York City housed the first headquarters of an affiliate, the Council of National Organizations (CNO). The new association inherited the treasuries of the former organizations and the library of the AAAE.

The broad outline of this unique structure was the product of the Sarah Lawrence Workshop. A description of the plan as developed there was first brought to the attention of the members of both the Department and the AAAE in an editorial signed by Bradford and Hunsaker in the first issue of *Adult Education*, the now combined product of the former *Adult Education Bulletin* and the *Adult Education Journal*. It read in part:

> It is proposed that a membership organization be developed which will operate from a multiple address rather than one address; an organization with a staff either paid by or donated to the new organization and located in strategic service centers throughout the country; an organization with a staff that is in reality a team of specialists, each member highly competent in his own field; an organization in which policy development becomes a systematic and continuing operating function supported by continuous and systemic planning and evaluation; an organization which because of shared leadership and shared resources can rapidly create and place into operation a far greater number of new and different services than would be possible for the traditional coordinating, information-giving and clearing-house type of associations.[1]

The operational implications of this ambitious vision were spelled out in an article that immediately followed, written, although unsigned, by Robertson Sillars, editor of the combined periodical. At the time, Sillars was an employee of the AAAE in its Cleveland office. Presented in question and answer form Sillars asks first, "Who will be the members"? The answer was inclusive: "All persons who are engaged ... in educational work designed to help adults to locate and learn to solve their personal or social problems."

After identifying the common interests of potential members such as needs assessment, program planning, selecting and using material and human resources, and conducting staff training, the question is asked, "What, specifically, will the association do?" The answer: consultation, field service and the organization of "cooperation among aspiring organizations ... to accomplish specific tasks in relation to research, leadership training ... and other matters of professional interest."

To accomplish all this, Sillars reports that "instead of the traditional pattern of a central headquarters the new association might have a number of headquarters. For example, one headquarters might maintain the central correspondence files and the membership records. Another ... might take leadership in assisting the field in developing training programs for adult educators. Another might become a center for the stimulation of research ...."

The question of, "wouldn't we need ... a high-powered director to run all these teams?" is answered with an implicit, "no". The article acknowledges "there would ... have to be an office somewhere staffed to maintain membership records and perform similar routine, but ... necessary tasks." It then advances the idea that "the Executive Committee and the service team chairmen meeting frequently and allocating among themselves definite responsibilities ... could fulfill many of the functions traditionally carried out by an organizational director. The president ... could expedite the joint planning activities, perform ceremonial functions and act as a spokesman ... between executive Committee meetings."[2]

Decentralized Headquarters

Once these innovative ideas were in place, that part of the plan that worked best for a period of about six years (the length of time it was needed) was the decentralized headquarters concept. During this time the NEA was, by far, the principal contributor of office space, personnel, travel funds for its own staff, and support services. Upon the founding of the new organization, AEA employees were placed under Social Security through an arrangement with the NEA. The first check of $94,000 from the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) was received by the NEA business Office and credited to an account set up on behalf of AEA. Bradford, a member of the AEA provisional Executive Committee, in addition to serving as a de facto member of the newly founded Adult Leadership editorial team, operated in a designated staff role as coordinator of research and training for AEA. I served as director of field service and was responsible for the development of the Area Organization and Conference project, established in 1952 by a $90,000 grant from FAE,* and of which Warren Schmidt was named director.

It is no exaggeration to say that, although one day in May the NEA Department of Adult Education went out of existence, the NEA's commitment to adult education went on without interruption. Far from being lessened, it increased as AEA's program steadily expanded. The cooperation of NEA's executive secretary, Willard Givens and the assistant secretary for professional relations, Lyle W. Ashby, was essential to the successful implementation of this operational plan.

---

*The AEA Organization and Conference project was originally housed in the Association's Cleveland office. Its principal purpose was to encourage the participation of state and regional affiliated organizations in the program of the AEA. Shortly after the program was organized, as a result of questions from the field regarding the utility of maintaining three offices once substantial support from FAE had been secured, the office of the project was moved to Washington and housed in the headquarters of the Division of Adult Education Service. At the same time the membership office was moved from Washington to Chicago.

Precedent existed within NEA and elsewhere for the contribution of services and personnel to organizations beyond their direct control. For years, the business of the Department of Adult Education was conducted out of whatever office housed its president. During these years, however, the Department, in addition to receiving a small subsidy averaging about $2,000 each year, had the help of the NEA central office in receiving dues payments and technical assistance in the production of the Bulletin. In a completely separate arrangement, Cleveland College of Western Reserve University contributed space and personnel to maintain AAAE after the ten-year Carnegie Grant to the Institute of Adult Education at Columbia University had expired.

AEA Administrative Theory

There can be no doubt that Bradford was the principal architect of the unique administrative design that came out of the Sarah Lawrence Workshop. In part, it reflected the administrative philosophy he found worked well at Bethel and, to the extent possible, he created this kind of an environment for those who worked for him. He saw himself as a team leader and consultant more than a boss, as a social scientist rather than an educator, and as an experimenter rather than a conformist. To Bradford (and this was before the emergence of the Chief

Executive officer in all the fullness of that term) "administration", however necessary, when compared to subject area specialization, was a relatively low level function.

In Explorations in Human Relations Training, published in 1953, Bradford describes the administrative function as a service for "those who carry on its [the Bethel summer laboratory] work and as a laboratory for learning about administration in the context of joint or group decision-making and of waves of involvement".[3]

Gordon Lippitt, brother of Ronald, had joined the staff of the Division in 1950 as assistant director of National Training Laboratory in Group Development (NTL) operations. Although employed out of funds received from the Carnegie Corporation for this and other purposes, his role and mine frequently overlapped. The first grant to the Division from the recently formed Fund for Adult Education was for a study of urban public school adult education. Gordon Lippitt was director of the project. I, in turn, had regular assignments at the summer sessions of the Laboratory in Bethel, Maine. I was a frequent member of teams brought together to meet the requirements of clients who had contracted with NTL for a variety of leadership development services that ranged in time from an afternoon to a week or more.

In the Division office, during frequently scheduled staff meetings, Bradford, Lippitt and I worked out our strategic approach to the tasks before us. Within the framework of these agreements, Lippitt and I decided questions ranging in importance from who would take what days off when the opportunity presented itself, to which one of us would accept a solo consultation request that was up for grabs. Seldom did Bradford give an order or veto a decision that Lippitt and I had worked on together. That he harbored dreams and plans which he did not always share with us is also true.

NTL Administrative Design

At the Bethel Laboratories (NTL) a similar modus operandi had been installed. The important functions were training and research. The high status positions belonged to those who led the T-groups and organized the research program. During the eight years I was most closely identified with the Bethel sessions (1949-1956) I was present as "administrator", usually a part-time responsibility, for four summers, on the training staff for two, a delegate for one and did not attend another. Initially, key policy and administrative decisions were made by "the small, intimate staff, holding very similar beliefs about the purposes of NTLGD."[4] In 1950, as a result of a three-year grant of $100,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, the formation of a Budget Review Committee became a necessity. The members were

Willard Givens, executive secretary of the NEA, Dorwin Cartwright, director of the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan, and Bradford. An Advisory Committee was "formed of the highest administrative person that knew about NTL from the universities then involved and who had faculty members on the Program and Planning Committee."[5] The members of these groups were, almost by definition, handpicked by the "small intimate staff."

Over the years, NTL became increasingly institutionalized. The Advisory Committee evolved into a National Board with an elected chairman. The Program and Planning Committee grew and developed less restrictive criteria for membership.

In the early years of the Laboratory, other individuals who served at one time or another in the part-time role of administrator were Robert Polson, a sociologist from Cornell University; Max Godson, Dean of the School of Education at the Ohio State University; Paul Sheats, Malcolm Knowles and Herbert Hunsaker. When on-the-spot emergencies arose at Bethel, needed decisions, at least in my experience, were quickly and quietly made by Bradford with only as much consultation with others as was minimally necessary.

The administrative arrangement as developed by Bradford worked well. By freeing himself from concerns about the minutiae of administration he was able to devote his time and talents to the major tasks and purposes of the laboratories. At the same time, he had a visible administrative mechanism in place to carry on such maintenance functions as would be required without denying himself the opportunity to intervene should he think it necessary. Throughout the years I was a member of the NTL staff, the ultimate decision-making body was Bradford and the small group of individuals who helped him plan and launch the first Bethel Laboratory in 1947.

AEA Administrative Structure

When NTL was in its formative stages, AEA was in the design stage and, simultaneous with its launching, the prospect of a broadly defined adult education magazine came into view. It would have been quite unlike Bradford not to envision exerting his influence on the flexible and somewhat porous policy structure of an organization that had yet to prove itself. In accordance with the Sarah Lawrence organizational decisions, in September 1951 Malcolm Knowles was appointed "administrative coordinator" of the new association, not executive secretary or executive director. "His original assignment was half-time coordinator of administrative committees and half-time director of the publication project"[6] As noted earlier, Bradford was a member of the first AEA Executive Committee,* the group which would, as Sillars reported it, meet "frequently" and allocate "among themselves definite responsibilities for administrative follow-up [and] could fulfill many of the responsibilities traditionally carried on by an organizational director".[7] In addition, he was able to make available to the new association the potential, part-time services of two experienced members of his staff, Gordon Lippitt and me.

The immediate program objectives of AEA were general, but it was planned for them to embrace such activities as "consultation and field services for the improvement of methods of research, leadership training, and securing community support for adult education,"[8] All objectives that fell within Bradford's range of interests and competency. His goals for AEA could not have been less than they had been for the NEA Department; including making the laboratory method of training an essential ingredient of all adult education training.**

---

*At the time of the Founding Assembly, Bradford was elected by write-in ballot to be on the provisional Executive Committee. His activities between that time and the First National Conference in Los Angeles were largely in the role of staff. For that reason he was not nominated for re-election.

**In February, 1950, an article by Bradford appeared in the Adult Education Bulletin in which he stated that, because of the pattern of inter-university cooperation which distinguished NTL's sponsorship, it had become "one of the country's significant centers for adult education research and advanced training."[9] I

The Genesis of Adult Leadership

The opportunity for advancing those interests and increasing Bradford's influence in AEA came sooner than might have been expected. The Fund for Adult Education, an independent corporation of the Ford Foundation, had been established in April, 1951. C. Scott Fletcher, president of the Fund, together with a senior staff member, Robert Blakely, were in attendance at the Founding Assembly. An immediate outcome of this fortuitous coincidence has been told by Bradford himself.

> I shall never forget one afternoon at the Founding Assembly when ... C. Scott Fletcher ... told Howard McClusky, Herb Hunsaker, Paul Sheats and me to come up to his suite.... He told us there that he wanted the new association to publish a magazine on leadership. He said it did not matter what it cost, but it must certainly be of high quality and certainly use slick paper. I still remember my feelings. On the one hand, I felt deep hostility at being ordered and being lured

---

am one of those credited with having helped in the development of the article and so, at the time, I obviously agreed. However, because the purposes of NTL were limited, as Bradford acknowledged, to "basic research in group process" and "the laboratory method of training",[9] many of the self-identified adult educators who held membership in the AEA could only accept NTL's contribution as limited to but one, albeit important, aspect of a much broader field.

> by more money than I had ever envisaged. On the other, I wanted the money and did not like myself for wanting it.
>
> We agreed, and he said that Bob Blakely ... would work with us on plans, which we did during the early winter of 1950-51. (sic.) (The correct date is 1951-52). In these meetings I suggested that it would be a new and valuable aid to have both a magazine and a training journal for leadership in one package. I know that the others were intrigued, and I thought that Blakely agreed.... So in 1951, we formed the magazine Adult Leadership which carried much we had discovered in work conferences and at Bethel. It turned out Scott wanted a journal that published articles about the lives of great men. After four years he withdrew support and the magazine changed.[10]

In the presence of other evidence, the last two sentences require substantial amendment. Much of the remainder of this chapter will be directed toward an examination of the stresses that beset AEA as a result of too much money becoming available too soon for a product that was incompletely understood and lacked the wholehearted endorsement of AEA's governance.

What emerged in May, 1952, was a periodical that, in many ways, resembled the one described by Bradford. In Sillar's words it was a "magazine for community and group leaders" who were "either unpaid or part-time adult education workers." Many of these he added "like the lady who was astonished to discover that she had been speaking prose all her life, do not know that they are engaged in adult education."[11] Knowles elaborates further. "Adult Leadership was also conceived in part as a device for broadening the AEA's membership base, on the assumption that many of its subscribers would move up the scale from selfish interest about techniques to altruistic interest in advancing the cause of adult education."[12] While wholly accurate, the statement reveals the attitude of AEA's founders many of whom--including me--consistently underestimated the positive relationship of the determination of practitioners to learn how to do a credible job with their equally strong determination to advance the cause of adult education.

FAE Expectations

It is clear that Fletcher knew exactly what kind of magazine he was recommending the AEA publish. At the first annual Conference of AEA in Los Angeles in October 1951, after a proposal for a new magazine had been drafted by AEA and approved by the FAE Board of Directors, he stated that "assistance in planning programs for adult discussion groups and in leading such groups is much needed by laymen in the field. The grant by the Fund to the Adult Education Association will be used for the publication of a magazine designed to help the non-professional people who are engaged in adult education work."[13]

This image of the service to be provided is confirmed in the grant letter to Howard Mcclusky, first president of the AEA, from Fletcher on July 17, 1951. In the letter, Fletcher repeated the above intention and added that it was understood the magazine would "include case studies of methods that have been used successfully, stories dramatizing the need for adult education, and discussion of personal and social benefits from adult education in the Modern World."[14] More detailed specifications were not spelled out but Robert Blakely, in providing informal comments on the initial draft of this chapter, wrote that Fletcher "did want emphasis on study discussion (ala Great books, etc.)" and was disappointed that "AL was predominately NTL [oriented] not adult education, and that it contained little, if any [information] about study discussion."

By the time Adult Learning was launched in May 1951 the Fund was already committed to support, or had underway, a nationally broadcast radio program "designed to show how individual communities have acted together of their own volition to solve local problems."[13] It helped extend the use of the educational film as a teaching and discussion aid and sponsored a series of public affairs interpretative reports over one of the national commercial networks. It gave additional support to existing, formally organized, discussion formats, of which the Great Books was, but one. It sponsored a series of Test Cities in which the impact of all Fund-sponsored activities could be observed. By 1952, it undertook to assist the National Association of Public School Adult Educators further sensitize local and state directors of publicly supported adult education programs to the significance of liberal studies as a part of the curriculum.

Had AEA's governance so elected, the magazine's budget was adequate to support a diversified editorial policy which would accommodate contributions directed toward the methodology of working with groups; meet the non-technical interests of adult educators working in universities, libraries and other formal settings; and undertake a review and analysis of the many programs supported by FAE. The imbalance of the magazine's policy was clearly revealed during the first year of publication when the March 1953 issue, themed around group discussion, failed to reference any of the study-discussion programs in which the Fund had an interest. In retrospect it is possible to say that to have been critical of these programs would probably have been less of a tactical error than to have totally ignored them.

Never-the-less, when the time came to renew support for Adult Leadership, Fletcher was sufficiently pleased with the product (or hopeful enough that the many discussions of FAE staff with AEA staff and governance would result in less restricted coverage) that support was continued. Fletcher was disappointed, however, that the periodical was not attracting more readers. The letter notifying Paul Durries, then president of AEA, that the grant would be continued, announced that beyond the basic grant of $94,000 for publication costs, the Association would receive an "additional $6,375 to permit extra promotion of the magazine."[15]

NTL Influence

The group initially appointed to plan the magazine was named the Operations Committee. Its first meeting was held in Chicago on October 28-30, 1951, a few days following the Los Angeles Conference. Robert Blakely represented the Fund. Of the remaining participants, five were members of the suddenly enlarged AEA staff, three of whom, although drawn from fields outside adult education, provided needed fiscal and clerical skills. Bradford was joined by two colleagues from the NTL core group, Ronald Lippitt and Herbert Thelen. Two publication consultants were present, one professor of adult education, William Hallenbeck; and two adult education administrators, Herbert Hunsaker and Thomas Van Sant.[11] The later two not only represented the AEA Executive Committee but also had spent a summer at the NTL Laboratory in Bethel and were strong supporters of this part of the program of the NEA Division of Adult Education Service.

Membership on the original committee, although not present at the first meeting, included Paul Durrie, director of adult eduction for the Des Moines public schools who also became the third representative of the Executive Committee; Stuart Chase, the author; Joseph Matthews of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service; and me.

Robert Sillars was named editor and, as noted earlier, Malcolm Knowles was designated half-time director of the Publication Project. In September, 1952, Kenneth Benne began a sabbatical leave from his teaching position at the University of Illinois and joined the staff as an editorial consultant. Bradford was "very active"[16] in the development of the magazine and throughout the first several years prepared many of its finest training materials.

Titles of the first year's volume were:

1. Program Planning
2. Spotlight on Leadership
3. Using Resources

4. Working Towards Goals
5. The Group in the Community
6. Getting and Keeping Members
7. Improving Large Meetings
8. Spotlight on Member Roles
9. Initiating Social Action
10. Leading Discussion
11. Evaluating Programs and Performance

"Each had an article or tool-kit [specific how-to-do-its] written by an NTL staff member."[16]

In his autobiographical chapter in Bradford's history, Benne describes the editorial processes that soon emerged.

> The method that we used in preparing issues of Adult Leadership was to organize a workshop in which social scientists meet with practitioners, and in some cases with adult education consumers, to explore an issue and to make plans for preparing materials on that issue in a number of the magazine. The job of the staff was both to organize and convene the workshop ... and to invent ways of presenting the material which the various members of the workshop prepared.... We did develop a new way of packaging social science materials for the use of practitioners, a way of

> bridging between social science interest and findings, and practitioner needs, resources, and interests.... The methodology employed ... has never quite been matched in subsequent preparation of training materials by NTL."[17]

Bradford's summary is, "I believe that no venture like it had been tried before. It accomplished much. The AEA, for many years, helped support itself by selling prints of materials in the magazine."[10]

Anyone who has employed the materials in *Adult Leadership* would undoubtedly concur both as to their usefulness for the purpose intended and the uniqueness of the presentation methods. However, Bradford's implication, quoted earlier, that the project came to a close because it failed to meet Fletcher's expectations is, at best, a vast over-simplification. Benne's conclusion that the "close hookup of NTL people with the *Adult Leadership* project" was terminated not only by "the withdrawal of the Ford Grant (sic) but, probably other conservative developments in adult education"[17] is nearer the truth. But whether or not the "other developments" represented conservative forces, or the progressive growth on the part of AEA members of a sense of their own professional identity, depends on the perspective of the viewer. To a social philosopher, such as Kenneth Benne, perhaps so. To those engaged in an organized endeavor to advance and expand the practice and understanding of what was beginning to be termed "a fourth level of education", definitely not.

The extent to which the editorial direction of Adult Leadership was perceived as having been captured by Bradford and his associates is well documented. The most objective data are found in a study of the AEA completed in 1959 by the Bureau of Applied Social Science at Columbia University. Based on personal interviews, questionnaire studies, and an examination of association documents, Edmond de S. Brunner and his associates reported that

> ...about 40% of the interviewees felt that the 'group dynamics crowd' had taken over or dominated AEA.... Another 30% denied that those interested in methods had actually gained control, but they emphasized that there had been conflict [and] that the dispute had been detrimental to the AEA. A minority felt that the combatants seemed more concerned with promoting their particular side of the controversy than with the welfare of the AEA.[18]

Five years earlier, in 1953, an analysis of both the editorial position of Adult Leadership and the methods employed in developing its content had been made part of a survey of AEA undertaken for the FAE by the management consulting firm of McKinsey and Company. In its report to the Fund it stated that "issue committees have been selected to incorporate different points of view. Dissenting opinions have on occasion been presented. And yet there are many impressions that the magazine is a partisan advocate and the position taken is that of the staff. We believe these impressions have a real basis in fact."

The authors of the report went on to say,

> ...it is precisely at the point of how-to-do that many controversies in the field of adult education arise. But is it at this point that the magazine staff has avoided controversy by assuming primary responsibility for ... the how-to-do-it sections [i.e., the "Tool Kits"]. It could well be the continuity of approach threading through these sections ... [that] has caused Adult Leadership to be identified with particular schools of thought."[19]

Robertson Sillars in his Ph.D. dissertation, Some Problems of Publication Policy in the Adult Eduction Association of the U.S.A., confirms the early autonomy of the Operations Committee and also acknowledges that "early evidence Adult Leadership was meeting with something less than complete acceptance by important leaders in adult education did not result in a re-examination by the AEA's Executive Committee of what audiences it wished to reach for what purposes."[20]

For all of this, the magazine, helped by the added promotional grant from the Fund for Adult Education, soon attracted more readers than certainly had any other periodical with an emphasis on methods in adult education. However, each subscription was secured at great cost. According to the McKinsey report, "since the Adult Leadership project got under way, approximately $80,000 has been spent on circulation and promotion. These funds have resulted in the creation and maintenance of a subscription list of 10,000 persons."[19] While the raw number of 10,000 subscribers may have been, at first glance, welcome news to those accustomed to membership figures of two or three thousand, it was received less kindly by a membership that was discovering it had to assert itself to escape being captured by a single ideology.

By 1953 "there were approximately three times as many subscribers to Adult Leadership as there were members."[12] The membership was composed primarily of individuals who did adult education work and knew they were adult educators. Many of these members questioned the extent to which the heavily endowed magazine was meeting the needs and principal interests of those who had looked forward to a new organization as a means of fulfilling objectives that neither of the predecessor organizations had been able, or willing, to provide. Within two years of the formation of the magazine, all these members could see they had in hand as "their" magazine was the significant, but specialized, Adult Education, a small bi-monthly journal focused on the full-time adult educator. They soon made it clear to the Executive Committee that, in terms of publication effort, they considered themselves second class citizens.

Advent of the Publications Committee

It was a result of strong advocacy of this point of view that in 1953 the Executive Committee disbanded the Operations Committee and formed a publications committee to set editorial policies for all publications. Kenneth Benne, now Berenson Professor of Human Relations and Director of the Human Relations Center at Boston University, was appointed one of the members of the new committee by the then president of AEA, Paul Sheats.

The result of this action was, again quoting Knowles, that in 1954:

> Adult Leadership became the official house organ of the AEA and therefore the publication that went to all members, with Adult Education being reserved for professional members. Accordingly, the contents of both magazines were changed--Adult Leadership carrying the news of the field, reports of experience, and articles of general interest (with about half of its pages initially reserved for the leadership training materials it had previously featured);

> and Adult Education carrying materials concerning the theory, philosophy, research, professional literature, and other subjects of primary interest to adult education specialists.[12]

In addition, a new and influential membership group was fast emerging--the university trained specialists and the professors who taught them. The first Ph.D. in adult education had been awarded in 1935. "By 1952-53 twelve institutions offered advanced degree programs in adult education and fifty-three institutions offered some kind of professional study in adult education."[21] The numbers increased every year. To keep pace with these changes, the Executive Committee was forced to face the question of professionalism in adult education. Sillars clearly defines the issue that raised its head in both the department and the AAAE but had not been resolved.

> ...For years the field has reflected a wide variety of attitudes toward professionalism, ranging from rejecting it completely (on the assumption that professionalism implies lack of the common touch and disparagement or neglect of voluntary leadership) to relying upon it exclusively (on the assumption that lack of professional training implies low standards and incompetence).[22]

The AEA made no attempt to define professionalism but, as

Sillars notes, it did recognize its existence by creating a membership category called the Professional Membership open to "all those who want to further the development of an adult education profession."[22] The dues were ten dollars, twice that of a general membership. Those who so self-selected, in addition to such other emoluments as the terminology might convey, now received both of the redesigned periodicals--Adult Leadership and Adult Education.

An Assessment

Like the work conferences, much that was significant and innovative lived on as the product of the training magazine. But, also like the work conferences, Adult Leadership represented the imposition of a concept by a minority upon a majority that was unprepared to quickly formulate a program design that would utilize a new approach to methodology. It was history repeating itself. The Board of the NEA Department of Adult Education had been unable to cope with the sudden acquisition of a full-time, paid executive secretary who, when he accepted the position already had in mind the outline of a radically different program. Equally, the AEA was unprepared to act collaboratively when presented with what was literally a golden opportunity to launch a service that could reasonably have been expected to link the interests of part-time and full-time adult educators.

The watch-word of the new organization was "unity"; one of its implicit purposes was to help adult educators speak with a single voice on matters of substance. This did not happen. The open-ended operational design of AEA; its decentralized headquarters, a part-time administrative coordinator and, an executive committee that had not yet been in office long enough to work out a program strategy, enabled minority rule to prevail. The project proposal submitted to the Fund for Adult Education had been drafted to a large extent by staff and received but limited review by the diversified membership of AEA's Executive Committee. If ever there had been a time for a Sarah Lawrence type workshop on program building, similar to the one held earlier on organizational design, this was the time. Unfortunately, the prospect of generous program funding by an outside agency did not exert the same pressures for creative collaboration and joint planning as had the need to circumvent the prospect of relative organizational poverty.

Had Adult Leadership been an independent publication venture, and been managed with a sharper eye for cost accounting, it might have achieved much greater longevity and become the group-work equivalent of the current Psychology Today. The magazine's weakness, as a publication of a national organization aspiring to represent the entire span of a multi-faceted educational enterprise, was that it concentrated on but one aspect of that field. Caught between FAE's money (and, perhaps, its relative inexperience in monitoring Fund projects), Bradford's overwhelming enthusiasm for an NTL type publication, and the uncertainty that persists until this day of the precise function of a national, generic adult eduction organization, AEA's first Executive Committee was not prepared to undertake oversight of the Association's most visible service. It is clear the magazine not only failed to fulfill the needs of the professional members of a professional association but also that it could not hold the audience for which it was designed. The FAE-supported, direct-mail subscription campaign organized in 1955, elevated AEA membership and magazine subscribers to a total of over 13,000. Once the campaign was over, membership dropped sharply and soon approached pre-campaign levels. According to Brunner, it was this discouraging result that accounted for the withdrawal of FAE support.

> ... The failure to hold more of the nearly 10,000 members secured by the campaign [was] disappointing to both the officers of the AEA and to the Fund for Adult Education. No foundation likes to be committed to continuing current expense grants.... In conformity with this policy, the Fund for Adult Education notified the AEA that appropriations for

> this operating expenses [the magazine] would be discontinued.[23]

With the changed emphasis of Adult Leadership, Bradford became progressively less involved in the work of the AEA. However, his insight into group functioning in problem-solving and goal-setting situations was valued highly. As his organizational presence declined, he remained a valued friend and personal consultant to many holding leadership positions within AEA. It was the single mindedness with which, as an association leader, he employed his gifts toward meeting goals of his own making, rather than helping the membership identify its goals and work toward them, that greatly diminished his long-range influence with AEA. As Malcolm Knowles reports, he was seen by some as imposing a doctrine of 'group dynamics' or 'methods and techniques as ends' upon the members."[24]

The key word is "imposing". Approached with less determination to cling to a single definition of what constitutes "adult education", the lasting result of the linkage to the social sciences that he engineered might have become part of the bloodstream of the field. This did not happen. Instead, as Bradford reports, "one can easily see how valuable the magazine was in spreading NTL ideas and in popularizing NTL itself."[16] The price paid was fostering disunity, rather than building cohesion, within the new association.

AEA and NAPSAE

The data that Brunner and his associates accumulated re the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE) and AEA includes comments that were critical of both organizations for permitting a separate organization of public school adult educators to emerge in 1952. The selection of comments is even-handed and the authors make no attempt to provide a statistical summation. It is clear however, that at the time of the publication of the study; seven years after NAPSAE was established, the investigators felt that "both public school adult education and adult education as a whole will be weaker without increased cooperation."[25]

The attention of Brunner and his colleagues was focused on AEA, not on the entire field of adult education. As a result, they had no requirement to speculate on the possible beneficial effect on the long-range development of the field had, in 1958 (to pick an arbitrary date), other institutional providers of adult education been as closely linked to AEA as was NAPSAE. Had that been true, the entire structure of adult education in the United States might have been strengthened. Not only had the organizations representing those forms of adult education not been folded into AEA in 1951, but there is no evidence that it ever occurred to any of their leaders to disband their organizations and become a part of the newly formed AEA. The reality is that after NAPSAE came into being in 1952, closer cooperation was maintained between it and AEA than between AEA and any other occupationally related adult education organization. This was particularly true in items of joint conference planning at both the national and state levels, in the promotion of federal legislation favoring non-vocational adult education below the collegiate level, and in the membership policies of NAPSAE which excluded members of other occupational groups from becoming members of the association.

As the program of NAPSAE began to unfold and to once again establish the close ties to the NEA that had marked the program of the former Department of Adult Education, the leadership of the AEA reciprocated by quickly recognizing the legitimate needs of an independent association of public school adult educators and supported a sharing of the intellectual resources to be found within the membership of both associations.

Chapter IX

REFERENCES

1. Bradford, Leland P. and Hunsaker, Herbert C. "The Building of a New Organization." Adult Education. 1:1-4, October, 1950.

2. [Sillars, Robertson.] "Toward a New Association." Adult Education 1:5-12; October, 1950.

3. [Bradford, et.al.] Exploration in Human Relations Training. [Washington, D.C.:] The National Training Laboratory in Group Development [of the National Education Association], 1953. p. 57.

4. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History, 1947-50. Bethel, Me., 1974. p. 58.

5. Ibid., p. 66.

6. Knowles, Malcolm S. The Adult Education Movement in the United States. N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. p. 235.

7. Sillars, op. cit. p. 10.

8. Ibid., p. 6.

9. Bradford, Leland P. "The National Training Laboratory in Group Development: A report to the Adult Education Profession." Adult Education Bulletin 15:68; February 1950.

10. Bradford, National Training Laboratories: Its History. op. cit. p. 71.

11. [Sillars, Robertson]. "Planning the New Magazine." Adult Education 2: outside back cover; December, 1951.

12. Knowles, op. cit. p. 236-37.

13. Fletcher, C. Scott. "The Program of the Fund for Adult Education." Adult Education 2:62-63; September, 1951.

14. Letter to Howard McClusky from C. Scott Fletcher, July 17, 1951. Fund for Adult Education Grant to the Adult Education Association, Ford Foundation Archives, Reel 4724-Frame 68.

15. Letter to Paul Durrie from Martha Howard, July 10, 1953. Fund for Adult Education Grant to the Adult Education Association, Ford Foundation Archives, Reel 4724-Frame 24.

16. Bradford, National Training Laboratories: Its History, op. cit. p. 78.

17. Ibid. p. 21.

18. Brunner, Edmund de S., William L. Nichols, II, and Sam D. Sieber, The Role of a National Organization in Adult Education: A Report to the Executive Committee of the Adult Education Association. N.Y., Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Science, 1959. (offset). p. 224.

19. Adult Education Collection, Box 9 McKinsey and Co., Management Consultant's Report, 1953 folder. "A study of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1953. Section II, p. 3-4. George Arents Research Special Collection at Syracuse University. (GARLSU).

20. Sillars, Robertson. Some Problems of Publication in the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University: 1954. p. 40.

21. Svenson, Elvin V. "A Review of Professional Preparation Programs. "Adult Education 6:62-66; Spring, 1956. (As quoted by Cyril B. Houle in Malcolm S. Knowles (editor), Handbook of Adult Education. Chicago, Adult Education Association, 1960. p. 125.

22. Sillars, Robertson. "A Profession Serving a Movement." Adult Education 4:125; March, 1954.

23. Brunner, op. cit. p. 62.

24. Knowles, op. cit. p. 237.

25. Brunner, op. cit. p. 277.

Chapter X

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATORS:

The Starting Points

The membership of the AEA at the time of its founding was 2,160.[1] In the absence of data to the contrary, it can be assumed that approximately one-half of the combined total represented former members of the NEA Department. However, since the Department contained members from other occupational groups, it would be incorrect to assume that on the first day of AEA's existence, one-half of AEA's membership were employees of the public schools. In the definitive study of the early years of the AEA, The Role of a National Organization in Adult Education by Edmund de S. Brunner and associates,[2] 21% of AEA's total membership in 1952 was recorded as employees of local and state public school programs. Other major occupational groups at this time were colleges and universities (25%), libraries (10%) and "government (including agriculture extension)" (11%), a total of sixty-seven percent. At the time these data were compiled, AEA membership had grown to 3,163. The appearance of Adult Leadership in the spring of 1952 may have contributed to a rapid growth of the remaining third of the membership drawn from outside the more traditional adult education institutions.

Thus, in 1952 there were at least 660 public school members of AEA. The specific interests of this part of the adult education population received scant attention from the participants in the Sarah Lawrence Workshop. In making plans for launching the new organization, the Organizing Committee had gone so far as to declare that "it was felt that adult educators in public schools did not need a separate membership organization of their own, and that their special interests could be adequately cared for by representation of their areas of work in the policy making body."[3] This pronouncement was in direct opposition to a fine example of double-speak expressed in a progress report issued earlier in 1950 by the AAAE and the Department of Adult Education Joint Committee in which the following declaration appeared:

> Thruout this report reference will be made to such concepts as 'unifying the profession of adult education' or 'establishing one, over-all organization'. Without violating the principles back of these and similar expressions, the Joint Committee wishes to state its unanimous and unqualified conviction of the importance of preserving the organizational identity of the separate and distinct agencies now serving specialized area of adult

education.[4] *

The discrepancy between the positions advanced by the Joint Committee and those attributed to the Organizing Committee can best be explained by the strongly held convictions of Bradford; Thomas Van Sant, president of the Department; and me that destroying the NEA Department was the first step toward unification. The persistent under-representation of public school personnel on important committees may have helped deafen us to the expressions of anxiety that must have been expressed by some members.

My opinions on this question were echoed back to me in a letter from Robertson Sillars in November 1950 in which he commented on an earlier letter of mine. "I think" Sillars said, "the question regarding the willingness of the public school adult education interests to enter into an autonomous national education organization is one on which NOC [National Organizing Committee] requires some kind of definite assurance. I am glad that you feel sure they would enter into such an organization."[5]

Bradford was equally forgetful of the pronouncement to preserve organizational identities. His position is reflected in the words that Willard Givens, NEA Executive Secretary, used in

---

*Although unsigned, the report may well have been written by me. The spelling of the word "thruout" represents the simplified spelling style then in vogue at the NEA.

June 1951 when requesting the NEA Executive Committee to begin the processes required to discontinue the Department.

> The NEA Department has been working for some time with the American Association of [sic] Adult Education to effect a merger of all major groups in the field. A meeting was held in ... May at which time the merger was brought about and a new organization ... was created. The new association desires to be associated with the NEA. There will be no change in the status of the Division of Adult Education Service.[6]

A motion was then made and passed which set in operation the procedures required to discontinue the Department in one year's time. Under NEA Bylaws, a Department would continue in existence for one year after the Representative Assembly had been notified of the intention to suspend operations.

Anticipating a Council of National Organizations

But even as strategies were being formulated at the Sarah Lawrence Workshop for the demise of the organization that represented one of the distinct occupational groups in the field, detailed planning was under way for a new semi-autonomous, special interest group to come into being, one composed of representatives of national organizations that carried on adult education activities as part of their program. As described in the article by Sillars, a Council of Organizations was projected "through which organizations can develop close working relationships with one another and with the association in meeting adult education needs."[7] The organizations would have no vote, but the members of the Council, assuming they held membership in the AEA, could vote as individuals and stand for election to the proposed Delegate Assembly.

At the Founding Assembly in May of 1951 two "work group" sections of representatives of national organizations were scheduled. As a member of the Assembly's Program Planning Committee it never occurred to me, nor do I think to other members of the Committee, that the public school interest groups should also be provided an opportunity to meet and work out a relationship to the overall association that made sense to them. As it was, they eventually did just that but, in the interim, the opportunity for making an organized, concerted contribution to the advancement of adult education was again delayed even as it had been during the work conference era.

As a result of the meeting of representatives of national organizations, the broad outline of a proposed Council of National Organizations emerged and the recommendation was made that the chair of the Council become an ex-officio member of the AEA Executive Committee. Plans were developed for an organizational meeting to be held in New York City the following spring.

This development did not go unnoticed by representatives of the public school segment present at the Founding Assembly. Fortunately, communication lines with those ushering in the AEA were kept open through a provision that had been made for designating four vice-presidents, one of whom would come from the public school sector. The individual elected to this position was E. Manfred Evans, at the time head supervisor of adult education for the Los Angeles school district and a member of the National Organizing Committee. The other three vice-presidents represented organized labor, the adult education council movement, and university extension. The elected secretary-treasurer was Fern Long, head of Adult Services in the Cleveland Public Library. Howard Y. McClusky professor of education at the University of Michigan and all but unknown to members of the Department, was elected president. He had been on the American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) Executive Council since 1946, had attended the 1949 conference of the Department of Adult Education of the NEA, and was highly regarded by all who knew him for his fairness and practical wisdom.

The choice of Evans as vice-president, from the public school perspective, was fortunate. An able and conscientious leader, his supervisory position was elevated to assistant superintendent of the Adult Education Branch, Los Angeles school district, which offered then, as it does today, one of the largest adult education programs of its kind in the country. Although for two decades California had been a leader among the states in adult education at both the collegiate and public school levels, only George Mann, chief of the Bureau of Adult Education for the California State Department of Eduction, had been continuously active in the NEA Department. (Paul Sheats, shortly after his term as president of the Department, moved to California as assistant director of the Extension Division at UCLA and no longer took an active part in the organizational affairs of the Department.) Directors from several local programs in California were usually to be found among those attending the Department's work conferences but representation from the Los Angeles district was rare. The first conference that Evans attended was the 1949 meeting held in Cleveland. George Mann, who had not attended the previous year's meeting at Purdue University, was also present.

As head of a major unit of state government, Mann's office would normally have been in Sacramento. However, because of the size and extent of many local programs in southern California, as well as his liking for the area, he was able to maintain his office in Los Angeles. He and Evans conferred frequently and it is probable that it was Mann who encouraged Evans to become active in the program of the Department. At the Cleveland meeting of the city directors, Evans, along with John Holden, Paul Durrie, and Albert Owens, was named to a committee charged with planning the program for local directors at the 1950 conference of the Department. Three of the four members of the committee would later gain prominence in the national organizations. Manfred Evans would become the first president of the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE) and John Holden of Hamilton, Ohio, and Paul Durrie of Des Moines later served as presidents of AEA. Albert Owens of Philadelphia is remembered fondly by some, not so fondly by others, as the first former member of the Department unequivocally to demand a complete separation of public school personnel from AEA.

The 1950 conference of the Department was held in Chicago. Evans was there and this time he brought with him principals of two of the adult schools. Before the conference was over he had extended an invitation for the Department to meet in Los Angeles for its 1951 conference, an invitation quickly accepted. The following April the AEA came into being, the invitation to meet in Los Angeles was extended to the new organization and it became the site of AEA's first national conference. Evans was the natural choice to chair the local arrangements committee. Program planning still remained largely in the hands of staff.

Manfred Evans as Leader

Evans was a superb organizer and a hard worker. He would usually come into his office mid-morning and remain there, or be in the field, until the last class came to a close. His schedule was always posted and any principal with an urgent problem could, if necessary, be assured of securing an appointment with him later that evening. He was as diplomatic as George Mann and equally dedicated to advancing the cause of public school adult education. He was, however, less inclined to seek a compromise any time he had reason to think the role or the importance of the public school in adult education was being questioned. He was deeply committed to the concept of inservice education for the instructional staff and the continuing professional development of the supervisors and administrators. In this he worked closely with Paul Sheats at UCLA. Above all, he had a finely tuned sensitivity to the kind of public relations that would advance the adult education program not bit-by-bit but by leaps and bounds.

A never to be forgotten highlight of AEA's first conference was the Hollywood bowl extravaganza. "An audience composed of seventeen thousand adult students and their teachers, the conference participants, and many city and state educational and legislative officials" sat in on a "magnificent exhibition and demonstration of the visible results of Los Angeles' public adult education program"[8]

However, many members of the former Department of Adult Education felt that other parts of the program were all too reminiscent of recent annual conferences. They had hoped that under new management this kind of programming would become a distant memory.

The conference opened on Monday morning, October 22, with the usual ceremonial and goal setting activities. That afternoon eleven different "Problem Groups" met to discuss ways in which "adult education workers from diverse fields and types of agencies can best work together ... in Developing Effective Citizens ... Improving Intergroup Relations ... Community Organization for Adult Education"[9] and similar topics. That evening a reception for the president of the Association, Howard McClusky, was scheduled. On Tuesday morning the Problem Groups reconvened. In the afternoon, reports from the group meetings were presented.

By the time the reporting session was completed, many in the public school constituency had had enough. Although meetings of

"Occupation and Interest Groups" were scheduled for the morning and afternoon of the following day, including a day-long pre-organizational meeting of the proposed Council of National Organizations, an almost universal feeling of discontent began to spread through the public school contingency. The old complaint was raised again: the convention planning groups had failed utterly in not recognizing the legitimate needs of public school adult educators for adequate time to work on their occupationally specific problems at the only time during the year when such an opportunity presented itself in a national setting.

The resulting frustration boiled over into a spontaneous meeting held in the nearest unoccupied room and attended by all state and local directors who could be corralled for the purpose. The concern was how to remain a part of the AEA, but to be able to have a voice in planning the overall program of the annual meetings and in scheduling time for meetings of their own.

Planning a Public School Adult Education Council

It was a relatively brief gathering. The solution they were looking for had already been worked out; the plans that had been developed for the formation of a Council of National Organizations. Manfred Evans explained the "Council" concept and consensus was quickly reached to petition the AEA Executive Committee for a Council of Public School Adult Education

Administrators. With this basic decision reached, those present hurried off to meet their hosts from the Los Angeles school system who would provide transportation to dinner and the performance at the Hollywood Bowl.

The following day the separate meetings of local and state directors were held as well as meetings of ten other occupational and special interest groups. The programs planned in advance for the public school personnel were scarcely disturbed as a brief time-out was taken in both meetings for those present to vote on recommendations for the formation of a Council and the election of a provisional steering committee with Manfred Evans serving as president. Action was also taken on the petition to make the Council a part of the organizational structure of AEA and to include the president as a member of the Executive Committee. That evening the petition was endorsed by the AEA Executive Committee and, on the following day, made a part of the working constitution of the Delegate Assembly.

The public school adult educators now had an organizational identity within AEA and a president. What about staff?

The following morning, after the AEA Executive Committee's favorable action was known, Manfred Evans sought me out. He first briefed me on the details of a meeting of the provisional executive committee the night before. One of the agenda items was whether or not I should be invited to serve as the executive secretary of the Council and, if asked, would I accept. Before giving me an opportunity to answer he told me that, in fairness, I should know that not all members of the group supported the idea. There was considerable skepticism about my ability to do the job based on my close relationship with Lee Bradford and my acknowledged loyalty to AEA. Speaking for himself, he said he had no question on that score.

I had visited Los angeles earlier in the year to dispatch some item of conference planning. My interest in the programs I visited and the knowledge I was able to exhibit about some of the major issues confronting adult education were, or so he appeared to think, evidence enough I was qualified to serve a group of public school adult educators. I am certain I also exhibited a high degree of commitment to the NEA and to it's assuming once again the kind of support for adult education within the public school system that it had first demonstrated with the founding of the Department of Immigrant Education in 1921.

After this preliminary discussion, Evans presented me with a series of questions. Would Bradford permit me to devote a substantial part of my time to serve as secretary of the Council? How tied was I to Group Dynamics? (It was well known I had attended the Bethel Laboratories in 1949, '50, and '51.) Would my existing commitments to AEA and to "Bethel" stand in the way of effectively serving the Council? Should he talk to Bradford about it? Should he first confer with Willard Givens, the NEA Executive Secretary?

I assured him that if asked to take on the job he had outlined, I could accept. I advised him I had been hired by Bradford to serve the public school sector but that in the two years I had been employed by NEA I had been unable to find a way of satisfactorily discharging that responsibility. I agreed with Evans that a courtesy call on Bradford by several members of the Council was highly advisable but assured him they need not fear the outcome.

Before our conversation concluded, Evans found two additional reasons to further support the case he had apparently made the night before to link me with the Council. I indicated I was certain, according to the AEA constitution, that no break with AEA was necessary if the Council were, even while setting up its own program, to seek departmental affiliation with NEA. Even more agreeable to him was my assurance that I knew enough about the on-going negotiations between the AEA and the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) that I was certain there could be funding for public school projects. This, coupled with the knowledge that the NEA would be paying my salary, became reason enough for even those with the greatest reservations about my candidacy to once again risk a tie-in with the NEA.

Official NEA-AEA Relationships

Shortly after the Founding Assembly, Bradford discussed with Willard Givens the need not only to liquidate the Department of Adult Education but to develop some kind of a relationship between NEA and AEA. It is unlikely Bradford would have suggested Departmental status. That would undoubtedly be unacceptable to AEA. What he did require was justification for himself and members of his staff to spend substantial amounts of time working for an organization without any ties to NEA. AEA was seriously understaffed at the time and needed NEA support to provide a minimum level of service.

On June 7, 1951, Robertson Sillars, at the time stationed in the Cleveland office as AEA Administrative Secretary, but writing from Bethel, Maine where he was attending a summer session of NTL, had advised Malcolm Knowles that "the interim Committee ... has appointed you Administrative Coordinator, without salary. This is an interim appointment, without specified duties, which the Committee hopes you will accept pending the making of more definite appointments after the Fund for Adult Education acts, positively or negatively, on our publication project proposal."[10] Had the FAE not responded positively, Bradford, assuming NEA offered no objection, would have been in a strong position to offer his services as the principal paid staff member of a relatively impoverished association. However, the FAE did respond positively to AEA's proposal. On July 17, 1951, Scott Fletcher advised Howard McClusky that the FAE board "voted unanimously to approve the request ... for a grant of $94,000 for the publication of magazine in the field of adult education. This amount is expected to finance publication for the first year"[11] It also made it possible for the Association to employ Knowles as Administrative Coordinator with salary.

The NEA-AEA Joint Committee

Even so, with NEA still bearing a large part of AEA's operational expenses through contributed services, some official linkage was required. A "Memorandum of Agreement" was drafted that among other provisions, called for the appointment of a Joint Committee to provide "the means by which both organizations will cooperatively deal with adult education interests of mutual concern." It was understood "that the interest of the Council of Public School Adult Education Administrators in the work of the Joint Committee will be expressed through representation of the Council among the appointments made by the AEA." It was agreed also that "the offices of the Division of Adult Education Service will serve as the Washington headquarters of the AEA, housing ...

the national headquarters for field services, publication of the AEA Newsletter, professional services committees, AEA membership, and the Council of Public School Adult Education Administrators." NEA further agreed to supply the office space and equipment "to service whatever functions are housed in this headquarters [and] the services of the necessary professional and clerical staff."

AEA for its part agreed to provide a full-time membership secretary, to pay all direct costs for processing AEA memberships to assure "a unified membership of adult education practitioners which will provide a service outlet for NEA activities in the field of adult education [and] full consultative ... services ... to secretaries and directors of NEA departments, divisions, and commissions."[12]

The progress of the Joint Committee proposal through the NEA Executive Committee, Board of Directors, and Representative Assembly at the 1952 convention is detailed below:

June 28. Executive Committee.

> Executive Secretary Givens reviewed events which led to the organizing of the Adult Education Association, particularly the fact that the new organization is a consolidation of the forces of the former Department of Adult Education of the NEA and the American Association for Adult Education. He pointed out to the committee the

desirability of maintaining a close relationship with the Adult Education Association and, therefore, the advisability of recommending to the Board ... and to the Representative Assembly the establishment of a joint committee between the NEA and the [AEA]. Such a joint committee would be similar to the joint committee which the NEA maintains with several organizations.[13*]

June 30, Board of Directors

Until this year there has been a division of forces in the field of adult education. One segment, the American Association for Adult Education, was a Carnegie sponsored organization. It has long been the desire of NEA to amalgamate these forces. Through the efforts of Leland P. Bradford this has been finally accomplished and the Adult Education Association ... has been formed. The NEA itself will continue to carry a Division of Adult Education Service within its organization, but the new Adult Education Association has requested that a joint committee ... be formed.... It was moved [and] carried that [it be established].[14]

July 3, Delegate Assembly.

---

[*] American Legion, American Library Association, American Teachers Association, American Medical Association, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Dr. Givens: One year ago, notice was served that this would be before you for action at this time. For 25 years we have had a running battle, I regret to say, between our Department of the NEA and the American Association for Adult Education.

After some years of democratic discussion, we got the two groups together, largely through the leadership on our side, of Dr. Leland Bradford. We thought that what was good for Adult Education was good for the NEA. The officers of the [AEA] agreed to abolish their organization if we abolished our Department and we would go together and set up an Association of Adult Education and then would have--and this is before our Executive Committee, a joint committee between the [AEA] and the NEA.

All we are asking you to do this morning is to approve the proposition put before you last year at the request of the Adult Education people to - I don't know whether to abolish is quite the right word, but I guess "abolish" is - abolish Adult Education and set up a joint committee between NEA and the Adult Education group.

That is the proposition, Mr. President. As a delegate, I want to move the approval of that recommendation. The motion was seconded ... and carried.][15] [*]

These extracts from the Proceedings of the NEA are illuminating not only in that they illustrate the progression of policy formation within NEA but also because of their revelation of the light in which Bradford presented twenty-five years of adult education organizational history to his superior officer.

The AEA initially lacked funds to pay the expenses of its members to a meeting of the Joint Committee. They were eventually secured as part of a larger grant from FAE. The committee, therefore, did not meet until May 1954. By then, the National Council of Public School Adult Education Administrators had become the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE) and, a month hence, would present its application for affiliation as a department to the NEA convention when it met in New York City.

Lyle Ashby, the NEA assistant secretary for Professional Relations, attended the afternoon session the first day of the Joint Committee's meeting. He opened the discussion by explaining "that generally joint committees of the NEA are merely recommendatory groups for both parent bodies." He further stated

---

[*] After 18 years of service, in 1952, effective August 31, Willard E. Givens retired as executive secretary of the NEA. Among the many honors bestowed on him at the time of the annual convention was his being named a delegate ex-officio.

"that the place of the Joint Committee in the NEA structure needs to be re-examined in view of the fact that NAPSAE has come into existence since the formation of the Joint Committee, and is now asking NEA affiliation."[16] The remaining day and one-half was spent in a wide-ranging search for a major function. Although twenty-eight suggestions are recorded as having been offered, the major outcome was the sponsorship by the committee of a meeting at the NEA 1955 convention on the adult education implications of school desegregation.

In recommending that the petition of NAPSAE for departmental status be accepted, the minutes of the NEA Executive Committee reported in 1954 "they have more than the required [250] signatures by members of the NEA.... If the departmental request is accepted [by the Representative Assembly at the following year's convention] the Joint Committee of the NEA and AEA should probably be terminated."[17]

In 1955, NAPSAE did become a department of the NEA and no further meetings of the Joint Committee were held.

Influence of the Educational Policies Commission

The saga of the metamorphosis of the Department of Adult Education into the National Association of Public School Adult Educators requires a final, personal note. It relates to the change that took place in the writer of this history from an uninformed, largely insensitive, observer of the public school's contribution to adult education into a staunch advocate prepared to take on all comers. The explanation is found, to a considerable extent, in the relatively slight, but profoundly important, exposure I had to the efforts of the Educational Policies Commission (EPC) of the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) to produce a monograph on adult education.

In 1949, John K. Norton, professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and chairman of the Commission, in speaking to the NEA Representative Assembly announced that

> ... the Commission has also conducted preliminary explorations in a third area - adult education. In this rapidly moving and complex period, schooling at the elementary, secondary and even through the college level is not enough. Adult education which attracts many more of our citizens ... is also needed. How this may be provided is being studied by the Commission.[18]

At the 1950 meeting of the Assembly, in reporting on projects underway, chairman Norton listed as one of them "a statement on adult education which will take its place beside those already issued for elementary and secondary education."[19]

At the 1951 meeting of the Assembly, Lee Thurston, state superintendent of schools in Michigan, reported on behalf of the president of the Commission and announced that "a book or booklet [is] to be produced on the subject of adult education, something along the theme that has already appeared in Education for All American Youth, and now something on the order of Education for All American Adults."[20]

By the 1952 meeting of the Assembly the project had been abandoned.

That a policy statement on adult education was not issued is regrettable, but reasons can be found to explain why. The first resource personnel called upon by the subcommittee to work on the study were Bradford and me. At a meeting of the Commission at the Westchester Country Club in Rye, N.Y. in the spring of 1949, we managed to perplex more than help the members of the subcommittee. Bradford, who spoke first, generated some initial confusion by emphasizing the primary role of adult education was to develop awareness of, and competence in, group process. I endeavored to speak about the various types of programs for adults offered by local districts and the leadership role of state departments. At the time I was too uninformed on this aspect of adult education to be much of an authority. Neither of us were again called upon to provide the EPC staff with technical assistance other than being invited to comment on successive drafts of the manuscript as they appeared.

The document went through three drafts. The first written by a member of the Commission's staff, the second by Harold Benjamin, professor of education at the University of Maryland,and the third by the Commission's staff. This last step with the understanding that "each commission member be asked to submit for the guidance of the staff a written statement of what he or she would like to see incorporated in the document." The final proviso was that its completion was "to be followed by a vote-by-mail."[21]

Each of the three drafts became progressively more specific and more focused on public education and the leadership responsibilities of the states and the federal government. Although it took the position that adult education is a public responsibility and should be free to whomever wished to enroll, it took a stand against earmarking any federal funds that might eventually be appropriated for the support of elementary and secondary education being used to support comparable programs for adults. This may have been a compromise designed to gain support for its strong stand for tax support at the state and local level. The third draft states, "the Educational Policies Commission believes ... that adult education is too important to be treated as a commodity available only to those who can pay for it.... An ample list of precedents warrants the use of tax money to support the cost of education for adults."[22] That the members of the Commission voted not to publish may have been because of this declaration.

At the time the draft was being prepared, local districts, as they always are, were hard pressed to find funds for the schooling of children and youth. Of the twenty members of the Policies Commission, twelve were appointed jointly by NEA and AASA, one each by the NEA Departments of Classroom Teachers, Higher Education, Elementary School Principals, and Secondary School Principals, and four were _ex-officio_. If the 109 page final draft--an outstanding statement on the need for and nature of adult education, its methods and approaches, its relationships to improving the quality and support of the education of children --had omitted the few pages dealing with local and state tax support, it might have secured a unanimous vote. But had it failed to also urge federal support for adult vocational education, manpower training, teaching English to the foreign-born, high school completion for drop-outs, and literacy education it soon would have been so overcome by events as to have dissipated its long-term effectiveness.

Even in the absence of a published document, the experience of being a part of its development had a transforming effect on me. Through participation in the first meeting of the sub-committee, reading and providing written comments on all three drafts, and talking in depth to other consultants called on by the sub-committee, I not only learned a great deal but also acquired a commitment to the role of public education in adult education that I never lost.

Perhaps it is but wishful thinking on my part, but I continue to hold to the opinion that if, on our first meeting with the sub-committee, Bradford and I had been more credible witnesses, the EPC staff might have found it useful to rely on us to a greater extent for technical assistance. Whatever the objections of some members to the final draft might have been, it is possible that with closer collaboration a way around them might have been found.

That Manfred Evans found my knowledge and attitudes equal to the task of serving as administrative officer for an association of public school adult educators I attribute, in large part, to the education I received during the development of the policies manuscript.

Chapter X

REFERENCES

1. Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Adult Education Movement in the United States*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. p. 223.

2. Brunner, Edmund de S.; Nicholls II, William L.; and Sieber, Sam D. *The Role of a National Organization in Adult Education*: A Report to the Executive Committee of the Adult Education Association. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Science. 1959. p.79. (offset).

3. *Ibid*., p. 47.

4. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 23, Founding Assembly General Materials folder, a Progress Report from the Joint Committee of the American Association for Adult Education and the Department of Adult Education to the Members of the above Associations, 1950. George Arents Research Special Collection at Syracuse University. (GARLSU).

5. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 13, National Organizing Committee folder, letter from Robertson Sillars to Robert Luke, November 15, 1950. (GARLSU).

6. *NEA Proceedings*, *1951*, p. 214.

7. [Sillars, Robertson]. "Toward a New Association." *Adult Education* 1:11; October' 1950.

8. [Sillars, Robertson]. "Our First National conference." *Adult Education*: 2,47; December, 1951.

9. "The California Conference." *Adult Education* 2:1; October 1952.

10. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 1, AEA Correspondence folder, Letter from Robertson Sillars to Malcolm Knowles, June 7, 1952. (GARLSU).

11. Letter to Howard Y. McClusky from C. Scott Fletcher, July

17, 1951. Fund for Adult Education Grant to the Adult Education Association, Ford Foundation Archives, Reel 4724-Frame 68.

12. Adult Education Collection, Box 8, Constitution folder, Memorandum ... concerning the establishment ... of a Joint Committee of the NEA and the AEA. [1952]. (GARLSU).

13. _NEA Proceedings_, _1952_, p. 242.

14. _Ibid_. p. 214.

15. _Ibid_. p. 133.

16. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 13, NEA - AEA Joint Committee folder, Record of the meeting of the NEA - AEA [Joint] Committee, May 22-23, 1954. (GARLSU).

17. _NEA Proceedings_, _1954_. p. 212.

18. _NEA Proceedings_, _1949_. p. 94.

19. _NEA Proceedings_, _1950_. p. 96.

20. _NEA Proceedings_, _1951_. p. 100

21. National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. EPC Worksheet, October 1951: NEA Archives. (EPC Archives, V. 30).

22. _Ibid_. _Education for American Adults_, 3rd draft. Prepared for the consideration of the Educational Policies Commission's Subcommittee on Adult Education, 1950. (Unpublished). NEA Archives.

Chapter XI

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATORS:

Program: 1952 - 1972

Two main streams of activity coursed through every aspect of the NAPSAE program. This held true from the time of its founding in 1952 until, in 1981, renamed by then the National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education, it merged with the American Association for Adult Education (AEA) to form the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE). One branch of NAPSAE's effort was directed toward strengthening--and helping keep strong--the commitment of state and local school systems to the establishment of educational opportunities for adults. The second was to engage--and keep engaged--the federal government as a partner in providing the additional financial aid required to ensure for all individuals, irrespective of age, in all states of the United States, an opportunity to seek completion of an elementary or secondary education.

These two objectives were not so stated in the constitution adopted in East Lansing, Michigan in October 1952 when NAPSAE came into being. Rather, eight "purposes" were named which ranged from the general: "to promote action programs that may seem best for the professional interests of Adult Education" to something as specific as "to study criteria for the analysis of educational needs, project a program of education to meet those needs and establish a method of evaluation of results."[1][*] The program emerged as it did because of the convergence of an increasingly mature awareness of the basic need for an organization such as NAPSAE--and the appearance of an opportunity to meet that need. Within a few months of its founding, the members of NAPSAE's Board of Directors had proved themselves experienced enough to know that the long-run needs of their branch of the adult education enterprise lay in strengthening its political structure--both within the states and in local school districts--and wise enough to know how to take advantage of a cornucopia of opportunity.

The year that intervened between the time of AEA's first conference in Los Angeles and its second meeting in East Lansing had been used to good advantage by the public school constituency. Spurred on by members of the Steering Committee of the Council of Public School Adult Education Administrators, teachers and administrators alike had been meeting across the country at state and regional meetings of adult educators. One of the first conclusions to emerge was that teachers, as well as administrators, were needed as members of the new organization.

---

[*] In 1963 the purposes statement was reduced to "give leadership to the development of adult education in the public schools."

The name of the organization would be changed to the National Association of Public School Adult Educators. The major concern was one of meeting individual needs, not the development of a national commitment. The only publication to appear during this period was an occasional leaflet entitled The Swap Shop, an exchange of activity ideas among the directors of local programs.

Morale, however, was high. After years of having felt used in the pursuit of other goals by individuals not directly related to their field of work, and disappointment in what they saw as the failure of AEA's first national conference to adequately address their interests, there was great confidence in the ability of the elected Steering Committee to build a meaningful organization. Full confidence in the NEA, however, had yet to be restored. This was accomplished quickly and dramatically.

The Study of Urban Public School Adult Education

In January 1952, as part of its effort to map the field, the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) requested the NEA, through its Division of Adult Education Service, to undertake a statistical study of the extent and range of public school and community college programs for adults. The assignment was completed in a prompt and competent manner. Gordon Lippitt, an NTL (National Training Laboratory in Group Development) staff member, was named by Bradford as study coordinator. Helen Allion, a person with demonstrated research and writing ability became the research assistant. Two sub-contracts were quickly let, one to the Research Division of the NEA for the study of programs offered by elementary-secondary school districts; the other to William S. Wood, on leave from the U.S. Office of Education, for the survey of public community and junior colleges. An Advisory Committee was appointed which included representatives of city and state directors of adult education, the U.S. Office of Education, and Bradford and me. In planning the community college survey and in shaping that part of the final report, the advisory committee was joined by representatives from, as it was then called, the American Association of Junior Colleges.

The single, most important action taken at the beginning of the study was the decision of the Advisory Committee to contract with the NEA Research Division to undertake the survey of programs in the public schools. The Research Division, which employed a staff of about fifty, was universally recognized as the outstanding authority in the country on teachers' salaries, school taxes, and other measurable aspects of public education. It was no secret that the U.S. Office of Education, whose own studies made in a comparable period were usually released several years behind those of the NEA, frequently called upon the NEA for up-to-date statistical information.

The questionnaire used in collecting data for the public school study, after having been approved by the Advisory Committee, was sent by the Research Division to every superintendent of schools in all communities of 30,000 population and over, and to every fifth community of 2,500 to 30,000 population. Long experienced in the techniques of survey follow-up, the Research Division achieved a response of nearly 100%. The Division tabulated the data and prepared the first draft of the report. The final draft was written by a member of the Advisory Committee, Robert Sharer, associate professor of continuing education at Michigan State University and a former state director of adult education in Michigan. A press release summarizing the results was distributed immediately and printed copies of the report were ready for distribution in September.[3]

Among the significant findings were that enrollments in smaller communities were increasing almost three times as fast as in the large cities; that there had been a recent, rapid growth in the variety of activities; and that more and different kinds of activities were carried on in those districts employing directors, whether full or part-time.

It is not surprising then that when AEA met in East Lansing the following month, a completely different spirit prevailed among public school people from that which had marked the Los

Angeles meeting. Using data based to a large extent on reports from the informal gatherings in the field, the Council's Steering Committee, in advance of the East Lansing meeting, drafted a proposed constitution and established a procedure for the selection of officers for the first year. The proposed constitution was quickly adopted, Manfred Evans elected president, my appointment as executive secretary reconfirmed and, what from that day forward was universally called "Nap-see" came into being.

At the conclusion of the Conference, the AEA Delegate Assembly met for one full day. The minutes note that "the request of the newly-formed National Association of Public School Adult Educators to become an affiliated organization of the AEA was unanimously accepted, approved, and referred to the Executive Committee for appropriate action".[4] True, there were Cassandras, both within AEA and the public school community, who predicted that the entire movement was placed in jeopardy by the willingness of the AEA to further encourage public school adult educators to build an organization of their own. The combined lamentations, however, were not sufficient to stop what had already been set in motion. One of the strong cards the NAPSAE founders had to play in discussions with AEA members was the repeated assurance that membership in the new organization would be restricted to members of their own occupational group.[*]

Important as were the actions taken at East Lansing, the most concrete evidence of NAPSAE, AEA, NEA cooperation was the agreement of AEA in June of 1953 to submit to the Fund for Adult Education, on behalf of NAPSAE, and with NEA serving as the banker, a detailed proposal for a public school development grant. The conceptual framework originated with NAPSAE committees. The NAPSAE Board retained full jurisdiction over its management. Eventually, confidence in the integrity of NAPSAE's program grew and the Association sought and received program grants from FAE on its own. Over a ten year-period, FAE contributed $663,000 to NAPSAE projects.[5]

Fund For Adult Education Support

The FAE grants had three overall objectives. The first was to demonstrate the importance of paid, specifically prepared leadership at state and local levels in stimulating the initiation of new programs and the curriculum enrichment of ongoing programs. The second was to develop a publication program which would be of help to practitioners whether or not a part of the demonstration project. Finally, a public information program was designed to heighten visibility of adult education as a significant part of public school operations. Findings from the recently completed survey of public school systems were cited throughout the proposal submitted to the Fund as justification for projects of this kind.

---

[*] In 1963 the constitution was amended to read "professors of education teaching classes in adult education in which public school adult administrators or instructors are enrolled, are eligible for active Membership in this Association"[2] The change was proposed by William S. Griffith, professor of Adult Education at the University of Chicago and a caring friend of the Association. Griffith was convinced mutual advantage would accrue if members of the academic community held membership in the Association. Griffith was president of AAACE in 1991-92.

In a single chapter it is impossible to report in detail the many different activities FAE support made possible. The best summary was prepared in 1961 by Henry Ponitz, chief of the Division of Adult Education in the Michigan State Department of Education and until 1960 chairman of the committee charged with public school development. The information reported in the next four paragraphs has been abridged and adapted from his chapter in the NAPSAE 1961 Yearbook, entitled "the FAE-NAPSAE Partnership."[6]

By making available comparatively small amounts of money--$8,000 for a one-year period--NAPSAE was successful in having a position of state director of adult education established in Colorado, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Georgia, Utah, Iowa, Ohio, Maryland and Kansas. Training programs for all state directors, whether project supported or not, began in 1958. The purpose of the institutes was to provide each of the state directors with a broad background of information about several areas of liberal adult education and to help them stimulate and extend training programs of liberal adult education in their states. The first National Institute was held in Princeton, N.J. in 1958. In 1959 and 1960 similar institutes were held at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y.

Initially, liberal adult education institutes for local directors were held in Minnesota, New Jersey and Georgia. Eventually programs at this level were greatly expanded and funds were made available to 15 states for in-service education of local directors.

One of the earliest grants to NAPSAE from FAE enabled the Association to make needed literature available to the field. Public School Adult Education: A Guide for Administrators and Teachers provided a reference to assist public school officials set up programs of general adult education. FAE underwriting of the project was greatly enhanced by substantial contributions of time on the part of many members of the Los Angeles program. A curriculum handbook in the area of adult civic education was issued in 1956. Subsequent grants to the Association for publications made possible the issuance of pamphlets and in-service materials designed to strengthen and extend concepts of liberal adult education in the public schools. Among these were The Case for Adult Education, Counseling and Interviewing Adult

Students, and When You're Teaching Adults.

The task of building a clientele for adult education is a never-ending one. To do this, it is necessary to work with members of the education profession in helping them further understand the role of public schools in adult education and to encourage the public to participate in the opportunities available. With a modest budget made possible by a grant from the FAE, it was possible for NAPSAE to develop a public information program which included, in cooperation with NEA, the production of a film on the new role of the public schools in general adult education, provide local directors with systematic services enabling them to extend their own public information programs, and accent public school activities in American Education Week. In 1959 and 1960--for the first time--adult education was identified as one of the daily themes of American education Week. (End of summary of Ponitz article.)

Robert Blakely, who would conclude his career with the FAE by serving as its vice-president, participated in many of the in-service education sessions planned by and for the state and local directors of adult education who participated in the demonstration projects. With his eloquence, wit and wisdom he single-handedly assisted in the crossover for many a program participant from a thorough understanding of the practicality of vocational studies to an appreciation of the beauty--and practicality--of liberal studies.

Publications and Public Information

NAPSAE's first major publication, Public School Adult Education: A Guide for Administrators and Teachers, originated with, and was carried to completion by Manfred Evans. Three Los Angeles Evening High School principals with the addition of Evans' assistant administrator, constituted the editorial committee. A serious effort was made to avoid having the handbook appear as a Los Angeles district manual of procedure. Only three of the fourteen authors were Californians. A nationwide search for photographs was launched and those that had to be posed using Los Angeles teachers, students, and administrators as subjects, were not identified as coming from there.

Robert Schenz, principal of the Jordan Adult School, and later to become a president of NAPSAE, was the "coordinator" of the project. The original plan was to identify authors to prepare manuscripts on topics in their area of specialization and then turn the manuscripts over to a publisher. However, in working on the book, enthusiasm for the task rose at such a pace that the entire process from final manuscript editing and page layout through to publication was taken over by the members of the Los Angeles committee working on the book. As part of the book's preparation, Schenz was sent by Evans on a nation-wide tour to visit notable programs and meet the authors. His assignment was to identify new ideas and procedures, work out chapter outlines, recruit photographs and, following Evans' instructions to the letter, make certain that each chapter submitted would be a practical, "how-to" approach to teaching and administration. In Evans' words, this practical approach "will lend vision and inspiration to leaders of adult education in the public schools of the nation".[7] His prediction came true. The volume was an immediate success and set the tone for all future NAPSAE publications. Earnings from the publication were used to publish revised and expanded editions in 1963 and 1969.

In addition to the FAE-subsidized production of books and pamphlets, the Association used membership fees to produce a steady stream of sharply focused leaflets. At one time, members were receiving four newsletters a month: Techniques for Teachers of Adults, Swap Shop (for administrators), the Pulse of Public School Adult-Education, (a general newsletter) and (partially supported by the FAE grant), the Public Relations Idea File. The leaflets Swap Shop, Techniques, and the Idea File were composed largely of reprints or rewrites of materials originally produced by local programs. The Pulse was developed from state and local association newsletters, reports of actions of NAPSAE's Board and program committees, and a daily scanning of the New York Times.

One of the off-shoots of the FAE-supported Public Information Program was the introduction in 1967 of an information program designed to assist all workers who were engaged in providing an elementary-secondary education program for adults. Among the other information dissemination modules developed was the organization of packets of research-based materials, available on loan, and assembled on topics for which information was most frequently requested. Richard Cortright, who had previously worked with Frank Laubach in India and then had been employed as director of Education in the Washington office of the Laubach Literacy Fund, became NAPSAE's director of research and special projects, and was director of this program. In 1968 the NEA took over the support of what was by then called "The Service Bureau for Programs of Elementary and Secondary Education for Adults" and Cortright was transferred to the Division staff.

Much of the credit for NAPSAE's successful publication program goes to Jack Parker, for a time NAPSAE's assistant executive secretary, and to Virginia Warren, author of How Adults Can Learn More--Faster. First published in 1961, her 48 page pamphlet quickly became a best seller. Within several years it had been translated into Norwegian, Danish, and Spanish. Both Parker and Warren had solid journalistic backgrounds. Parker had been director of Public Information for the Indianapolis school system. Mrs. Warren had previously been employed as a staff writer in NEA's Division of Press and Radio. Thomas Gilligan, who succeeded Parker, had been a teacher of journalism and faculty sponsor of the student yearbook at one of the large high schools in Denver, Colorado. During that time, he earned a Ph.D. in adult education at the University of Denver.

NEA Support

Obviously, NEA itself was a heavy contributor to the FAE/NAPSAE partnership. Staff work on the newsletters, which at times required meeting weekly deadlines, was provided, in part, by the three members employed under the terms of various FAE grants, and the three members of the NEA Division of Adult Education staff assigned to work on NAPSAE projects.

No part of the development program would have achieved the ring of professionalism required for its success had it not been for the continuous contributions of NEA staff employed in other Divisions. The NEA Division of Press and Radio not only provided consultative and technical help in filming Learning for Life, the 28 minute film, the cost of which was partially supported by the FAE, but arranged for 250 television stations across the country to schedule showings. Once the television commitments were met, the film was rented to many local school districts; this time, utilizing as the booking agent, NEA's Audiovisual Service.

The Publication Division's staff of editors, proofreaders, artists, indexers, and photographers come forth in present memory as though they were part-time members of the NAPSAE staff. While the Association paid the cost of materials and supplies, in most instances NEA's contribution of the time of these many talented individuals was not reflected in NAPSAE financial statements. In addition, working closely with the editor of the NEA Journal, NAPSAE was able to identify both topics and authors for articles appearing throughout the year in a magazine that approached the one-million mark in circulation.

Membership Services

NAPSAE's direct contribution to literacy education was its sponsorship of Operation Alphabet, a series of 100 television lessons. First produced by WFIL-TV in Philadelphia, in cooperation with the Philadelphia Board of Education's Adult Extension Division, it was recognized at the time it went on the air as one of the outstanding education-by-television ventures in the United States. After several repeat showings in the Philadelphia Area, a grant from the Anneberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania to the

Philadelphia Board of Education made it possible to offer the tapes to other stations without charge other than the cost of shipping the reels between stations. Eventually, the demand for the tapes exceeded the terms of the grant and in 1962 NAPSAE was asked to take over.

The immediate cooperation of NEA's Audiovisual Service enabled the Association to accept the opportunity. Very quickly a nation-wide tour of the tapes was arranged. Under the provisions of the Public Information grant from FAE, NAPSAE developed home study materials which were sold to community groups and school districts in their viewing areas. The series was shown in its entirety in 60 cities before the tapes began to wear. Elmer Mueller, state director of adult education in Minnesota and president-elect of NAPSAE, then secured from the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company the contribution of 100 thirty-minute videotapes so that this successful literacy series could live on.

NAPSAE's multiplicity of direct services was the principal reason for its attractiveness as a membership organization. Even so, useful services need to be made known to those who can use them. Because of Parker's and Gilligan's promotional skills, membership in NAPSAE rose to its highest levels in the later half of the Sixties. Approximately 75% of the number, around 5,000, were part-time teachers of adults, known as Associate Members. Most individuals in the Active Member category were full-time administrators or supervisors and only they were eligible to vote. Active Members, varying between 1,500 and 1,800 in number, received all of the Association's membership leaflets. In addition, in August of 1967 there were 372 subscribers who received the same publications as did the Active Members.

The dues for Associate Members were always pegged at about one-fifth of those for Active Members. In return they received a subscription to Techniques, issued eight times during the year. For those teachers who lived in the vicinity of one of the annual conferences, a useful service was Teachers' Day. Presented on the final day of the conference, always a Saturday, it provided a day-long menu of "how-to" clinics and workshops, taught by master teachers in the area. In addition to being useful in their own right, many of the sessions generated materials and ideas for Techniques.

Grants received from the Fund for Adult Education enabled NAPSAE to meet its first objective--a demonstration of the potential effect of state and local financial support for adult education. Support for the second--enactment into federal law of the means of assuring equal access to a basic education, irrespective of age--was largely the result of the NAPSAE partnership with NEA.

The Legislative Thrust

Both the NEA Department of Immigrant Education and the NEA Department of Adult Education had made representations on behalf of the educational needs of the populations reached by their members. Beginning about 1940, as has already been told, interest in influencing federal education had given way to other considerations. For more than ten years, legislative activity on behalf of the general educational needs of adults was limited to initiatives within the states--some succeeding surprisingly well, others failing to make any change in existing attitudes of state legislators about age requirements as a criterion for access to an elementary-secondary education.

In 1955 NAPSAE made its debut as a legislative activist, a field in which the NEA already had successfully established itself. In that year, Congress created a Subcommittee on Low Income Families as part of an investigation undertaken by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The Subcommittee had been appointed to study the relationship between low educational attainment and low family income. I was invited to testify and this could have provided an entry for NAPSAE to begin developing a legislative program. Unfortunately, neither I nor the Executive Committee exploited the opportunity and the Association failed at that time to become further involved in seeking solutions to an acknowledged problem.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the initiative for awakening NAPSAE to its legislative responsibilities came from the States. At the 1959 meeting of the Association, Richard J. Smith, then the assistant superintendent of the Adult Education Branch of the Los Angeles school system and later (1965-66) president of the Association, lectured the members during the annual business meeting on their failure to exercise legislative leadership.

Following Smith's somewhat impassioned statement, the Executive Committee began to make plans for the development of a legislative program. John Lumley, who at that time held the title of assistant executive secretary for federal relations in the NEA, brought the NAPSAE Board up-to-date on what to do--and where to begin. Finding the right staff to lead the charge was not long in following.

In 1960 Thomas J. McLernon, at the time an associate in adult education with the New York State Department of Education, joined the Division staff as assistant director. One of his first responsibilities was to conduct fact-finding surveys in the areas of state legislation, certification, and salaries. The latter had been initiated in 1945 by Thomas Van Sant of the

Baltimore Public Schools. The results of McLernon's findings were printed in NAPSAE publications as they appeared. A summary of the three was published in 1961 in NAPSAE's first *Yearbook.*[8]

After 1961, McLernon's job assignment became almost exclusively one of facilitating the Association's federal legislative objectives. In that year, Sam Hand, director of adult education for the State of Florida and NAPSAE's president, appointed the Association's first legislative committee. McLernon was named chairman. As an employee of NEA, not of NAPSAE, it soon became apparent that with his access to NEA legislative personnel, he could serve far more effectively in a staff, rather than in a policy role. Once the federal relations expertise of NEA and the sharply targeted lobbying force of NAPSAE were joined, the march of public school interests toward securing the aid of the federal government in assuring equity for adult students in acquiring at least a high school education was underway.

It would be three years before the first tangible results were obtained. In January 1964 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act were passed providing $100 million for the general education of youths in occupational training and basic adult education for unemployed adults. As part of a coalition with other organizations, NAPSAE participated in a "get out the letters" campaign to its members that proved effective. Wilmer Bell, director of adult education in Baltimore and president of NAPSAE, was present at the Rose Garden signing. In August of the same year the language of earlier bills for non-restrictive basic adult education was incorporated into the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA). McLernon was present when that legislation was signed into law, again by President Johnson.

In January of 1965 McLernon resigned from the Division to accept a position as head of NEA's Regional Office in New York City. In that same year, the position of assistant executive secretary of NAPSAE became open and James R. Dorland of Canton, Ohio, and director of one of the Association's FAE funded demonstration programs, was appointed to the vacant position.

With McLernon's departure it became Dorland's responsibility to facilitate the advancement of NAPSAE's legislative agenda. Although passage of EOA represented the first Congressional authorization for federal funding of general education for adults below the college level without reference to vocational training or occupational status, it was only a beginning. The next task was to transfer authority for the administration of Adult Basic Education from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. This was accomplished in November 1966 by including the program as Title III of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act of 1965, legislation designed primarily to increase educational opportunities for children living in economically depressed areas. The new Title was designated the Adult Education Act of 1966.

Another part of the NAPSAE legislative agenda was to extend the definition of adult basic education to include completion of secondary school. This goal was reached in 1970 by amending the purpose of the Adult Education Act to "expand educational opportunity and encourage the establishment of programs of adult public education that will enable all adults to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school...."[9] One of the definitions added to the legislation was that an adult was "any individual who has attained the age of sixteen." A second was that the term "academic education" used in the Bill was understood to mean "the theoretical, the liberal, the speculative, and classical subject matter found to compose the curriculum of the public secondary school."[9]

Building on the landmark legislation of the sixties, the federal government moved into a position of leadership in extending the right of a basic education for all citizens--children and adults. As an indication of forward progress it is worth noting that, in respect to adult education, the initial authorization under EOA was $18,612,000. The appropriation for the Adult Education Act for 1992 was $235,750,000. Additionally, Congress in 1988 authorized $1 billion to normalize the conditions of newly legalized aliens, a substantial amount of the fund expended was for adult remedial education. Other federal programs in which the reduction of illiteracy is a component are the Job Training Partnership Education Act and the Family Support Act.

NAPSAE Legislative Partners

NAPSAE had many allies in the pursuit of its goals. The AEA not only sanctioned its founding but served as the vehicle for conveying its first request for program support to the Fund for Adult Education. It continued, for as long as the two organizations existed, to work for the same legislative support as did NAPSAE in the struggle to contain illiteracy, a mission carried on today by the successor organization, the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.

In its legislative efforts, NAPSAE had the immediate advantage of seeking the enactment of legislation that had the support of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. The cooperation of the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was thus assured. Edwin Brice and Roy Minnis of the U.S. Office of Education advised members of both NAPSAE and AEA, as well as all others who might inquire, of who ought to see whom in the upper reaches of government about problems current and anticipated. John Lumley of the NEA Legislative Division served continuously as strategist, advocate and gatekeeper.

In each of the states in NAPSAE's network, the two most important political allies were the executive secretary of the state education association and the chief state school officer. Foremost among the state secretaries supporting adult education were Fred Hipp of New Jersey and Arthur Corey of California. In some states the president of the state teachers association, although in office for but one year, spoke to the importance of the public schools in extending the adult education opportunity to all. In Florida, Braulio Alonso, latter to become president of the NEA, was one such person.

Those states which already had state supported programs of adult education usually had a chief state school official who endorsed the program. In states receiving NAPSAE grants for the employment of a state director, the attitude of the head of the state's education department was a principal criterion taken into account in making the grants.

An important forward step was taken within NEA when, in 1964, the Delegate Assembly for the first time passed a Resolution which, in setting forth standards for federal financial support, asserted that "federal programs of specific aid be continued or improved in addition to comprehensive federal support"[10] This of course, endorsed general adult education as a recipient of federal aid. To a large extent, this action represented stated policy catching up with practice. As early as December 1962, Robert Schenz was invited to serve as a consultant to the NEA Legislative Commission at its meeting in Chicago. One of the Commission's resolutions called for the support of legislation to meet "expanding public school adult education programs which will make available the opportunity for out-of-school youths and adults to complete elementary and secondary education necessary for technical training and higher education."[11]

Important as was this help from many quarters, it in no way lessened the seemingly endless tasks encountered by the NAPSAE staff. At one point, this called for tracking the progress of at least ten bills through committees and subcommittees in the House and Senate prior to the inclusion of one of them in the ESA. Keeping track of helpful--and not so helpful--amendments that would appear from time-to-time required equal vigilance.

There were other tasks, however, that demanded the full involvement of the membership if a successful legislative program was to become a reality. These included helping identify knowledgeable witnesses who could find ways of securing funds for trips to Washington; drawing together useful, up-to-the-minute, state-by-state statistics; conferring with members of both the House and Senate whenever they returned to their home state for a visit (sometimes inducing them to come to the school and visit classes in progress); and constantly urging members of the Association to "keep the letters" coming.

The State Affiliates

The readiness with which the members responded to the many demands made upon them was due in large part to the presence of a growing number of state affiliated organizations. These associations had as an objective, in addition to whatever else they might do, mobilizing support in every community and in every county for a federal enactment which would bring into each state fiscal support for non-collegiate, general adult education.

In the decade before NAPSAE came into being, local adult education councils existed in few large cities and metropolitan areas. Adult education associations had been organized in a number of states and a few regions. The effectiveness of local councils, almost all of which supported a paid staff, was limited by the necessity of directing much staff time toward fund-raising. The state associations held useful annual conferences and published informative newsletters. However, with fiscal resources limited to members' dues, and personnel restricted to the time contributed by volunteers, only a small dent could be made on the gargantuan tasks many state and regional associations set for themselves; tasks described by one writer as, "to coordinate adult education programs ... exchange information, train teachers, and share experiences."[12]

In those states with state aided programs, associations of public school adult educators usually existed alongside the broadly based adult education membership organizations. The tasks confronting the public school groups--like those facing other occupationally centered voluntary associations--tended to be more narrowly focused and usually had legislative activities as a principal concern. Unlike the situation that developed a decade earlier at the national level, the public school membership organizations and the broadly based, general associations existed compatibly side-by-side within the states.

After 1952 this compatibility carried over to the national organizations. In part, this was a natural result of the AEA's Area Organizations and Conference Project being headquartered in the same NEA office as was NAPSAE. As one example: In June 1955 John Bigger, NAPSAE's Assistant Executive Secretary, wrote to Malcolm Knowles advising him that "the decision of the New York State Public School Adult Educators to form a NYAPSAE [New York

Association of Public School Adult Educators] ... opens the door to the formation of a New York state AEA". Bigger urged Knowles to send a memorandum to the "New York State Delegates [to the AEA Delegate Assembly] discussing the possibility of establishing a state AEA in the light of the public school mens' discussion."[13]

Field Work Priorities

My prior experience as a field representative for the 7th Regional Office of Civil Defense, as an employee of adult education councils in Chicago and Cincinnati and, after AEA was founded, installed as director of field service, made it natural for me to maintain a special interest in NAPSAE's affiliate relationships. I was strongly convinced that the only certain way NAPSAE could firmly establish an image as a service centered organization was to assign a priority for field service to the requests received from the state affiliates. Such visits made available to the NAPSAE organization information about individuals with leadership potential, uncovered sources of timely information for the publication program, and helped the staff keep its attention centered on what the membership was thinking and doing.

In the Association's field work, recognition of NAPSAE as a department of the NEA was, in most instances, all that was required to enable the officers of the NAPSAE affiliates and members of the NAPSAE Board and staff to gain the attention of the officers and staff of the state education associations. Similarly, the NEA identification, plus the whole-hearted backing of Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, frequently eased the entrance of the state director of adult education, sometimes a not very elevated position in the education agency, into the office of the State Superintendent. Fuller became well known to NAPSAE members as a result of his testimony before Congress on pending adult education legislation and his attendance at a number of NAPSAE professional development conferences. In addition, he regularly invited me to attend the annual luncheons of the Chief State School Officers held each February in Atlantic City. This opportunity provided a time for meeting new members of the Council and renewing acquaintanceships with those already known.

An example of the way in which the field service program was designed to work is found in a report in a NAPSAE publication of Thomas McLernon's three-day trip to New York State in 1962.

> In the knowledge that the pressures in local districts are always intense for all state funds to go for the education of children, the New York Association of Public School Adult Educators has been working closely with the New York State Legislature in trying to secure a modification of

the Diefendorf proposal. [To lump all state aid funds into a single package to be spent on whatever programs local districts thought best.] At the invitation ... of NYAPSAE, Thomas J. McLernon, assistant director of the Division of Adult Education Service of the NEA, spent three days in Albany the first week of March, conferring with key members in both Houses of the State Legislature and with the Commissioner of Education.[14]

In commenting on the effect of McLernon's visit to the state, R.J. Pulling, chief of the State Education Department's Bureau of Adult Education, said:

> Circumstances are such that we don't expect to get a major adjustment in the proposed legislation, but we know that Tom McLernon's activities, as well as the activities of the association and of selected superintendents and board members, have done much to convince some of the political leaders that adult education does have a serious concern of many thoughtful people and that its importance cannot be overlooked.[14]

The news item was followed by a "50-second" editorial in which I made the following observation:

> All too often ... staff members of national associations are called upon to make speeches to those

> already converted ... or sit at head tables as 'a representative of-.' If there is any time left over after this, other work can be done. There are times, of course, when adult educators with national responsibilities can most effectively help their colleagues by performing informational or symbolic functions. However, many more times, individuals who work from the perspective of a national office can be still more helpful in a 'shirt-sleeves' role. Helping plan a conference may have a more lasting effect than attending a conference. If time is limited, and a choice has to be made, meeting with the executive committee of a state education association planning a legislative program--or talking with key people in the political and governmental structure--may add up to more in the long run than giving a keynote address ....[14]

The many intertwining relationships between NAPSAE members and other state and national organizations had its sub-plots such as the one described as taking place in New York State. Also, like the unfolding of a long novel, they eventually resolved into one climatic event: the rapid establishment in 1965 in 46 state departments of education of federally funded, state assisted, (90% Federal, 10% State) offices of adult education. Two years later, once the program was transferred to the Office of

Education, federal funds began flowing from the U.S. Office of Education to State Departments of Education for distribution to local districts. These, by and large, were used to recruit teachers to receive needed education in the methods and materials of adult education and to then serve as part-time teachers in the ABE (Adult Basic Education) program.

However, as finally enacted, the legislation reflected one serious omission. Although funds for teacher training in the states were available, none were earmarked for the training of the teacher trainers. Cooperative efforts on the part of the staff of the U.S. Office of Education, NAPSAE, and the Fund for Adult Education soon bridged the gap. Edwin Brice and Roy Minnis at USOE developed a proposal, funded by the FAE, which provided for three "trainer of trainers" workshops to be held at the Universities of Maryland, New Mexico, and Washington state. To launch the planning, funds were made available to NAPSAE to convene a conference of representatives of teacher training institutions, state and local adult education programs, and adult basic education specialists. One recommendation of the conference was that the content generated by the pilot workshops be made available to NAPSAE to develop a guidebook for use by all teacher trainers in this field. The publication[15] met with immediate acceptance and went through six printings before the appearance of other related materials began to take its place.

This cooperative effort represented the entry of colleges and universities into active participation in the federally funded ABE program. The following year, using appropriated funds, "trainer of trainers" programs were undertaken by nine universities. Since then, as the number of participating institutions has continued to grow, the literature of adult education has come to reflect a sizable commitment of higher education to the continuing study of ABE in all its aspects.

The End of the Beginning

The FAE grants, the successful legislative campaigns, a pattern of mutually beneficial relationships with other national organizations and associations, and an organizational base in many states,* all contributed to the continued advancement of adult education in this country in the third quarter of this century.

In the fall of 1966, Sam Halperin, deputy assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed the NAPSAE conference. He congratulated NAPSAE members by telling them

---

*By 1965 there were 18 state affiliates, 29 in 1972 (when NEA discontinued its financial support to the Department) and 36 in 1982 when NAPSAE joined with AEA to form the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.

> It is no exaggeration to suggest that there never would have been an adult basic education program if it had not been for the excellent representations which your national leadership--and many of you in the field --made to the U.S. Congress; but I know that you do not wish to rest on your laurels and, in fact, historical forces will not let you do so. The magnitude of the problem of adult illiteracy and under education is so great, and the impatience among our political leaders is so substantial, that I believe you will simply be carried in one way or another into an all-out attack on these problems.[16]

NAPSAE Management Style

NAPSAE was fortunate to come into being at a time when the FAE was still expanding its grant program. It was equally fortunate in being welcomed back into the NEA at a time when its members were in a position to know and appreciate the advantages of NEA affiliation to a far greater extent than had been possible when the diversified operations of the Division tended to obscure the core services available from NEA central and its family of departments.

The circumstance of NAPSAE and NTL being housed in the same office, my prior experience as an NTL staff member, and the more or less regularly scheduled Division staff meetings which brought together individuals from both programs, translated into a NAPSAE management style that tended to adopt some NTL practices, adapt others, and reject a few. Not to be overlooked was the reality that the attractiveness of employment by an NEA affiliated organization greatly eased the task of finding highly qualified individuals to fill staff positions when vacancies occurred.

The central features of overall NAPSAE management can be summarized as follows:

1. A policy of maximum cooperation with NEA and other Departments.

2. Decision-making, both in meetings of the NAPSAE Board and of the staff, based on the principle that the most effective decisions were those that could be made at the lowest level in the hierarchy consistent with good information.

3. Meetings of both the Board and of the staff cooperatively planned with an effort made to reach consensus through discussion rather than by means of majority vote.

4. Chairpersons of committees were appointed by the president; committee membership as determined by committee chairs was in accordance with Board-directed policy. Criteria included geographical diversity, a mix of state and local directors, maximum utilization of racial and ethnic representation, and the

involvement of members new to the Association. The day preceding the annual meeting was devoted to committee meetings. The day after to a meeting of the newly elected Board.

5. Meetings of the Board usually followed a pattern of an opening agenda-setting session, the appointment of sub-committees to work on individual items, and general sessions to act on the sub-committee reports.

6. One of the semi-annual Board meetings was always held at NEA headquarters and a looked-forward-to feature was the appearance at one of the luncheon sessions of a prominent educational leader from within NEA, one of the Departments, the federal government, or other relevant resource.

The net result, at least in my admittedly less than completely objective point-of-view, was to place a premium on imaginative thinking, to strengthen alliances with other like-minded associations and agencies, foster feelings of inter-dependence among members of the staff and between staff and Board members, and provide opportunities for personal growth and professional development. These, and similar democratically oriented procedures were seen as prerequisites for taking advantage of the well-deserved cornucopia of opportunity the members of NAPSAE had earned.

Chapter XI

REFERENCES

1. "Constitution. National Association of Public School Adult Educators." Adult Education 3:15, November, 1952.

2. "Constitution. National Association of Public School Adult Educators." Focus on Public School Adult Education. Fourth Yearbook, Washington, D.C.: NAPSAE, a department of the National Education Association. 1964. p. 162.

3. National Education Association, Division of Adult education Service. A Study of Urban Public School Adult Education Programs in the United States. Washington, D.C.: the Division. 1952, p. 171.

4. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 20, Reports, Handbook, Notes, and Miscellaneous, 1952, October 22-23, Report of the Delegate Assembly folder. George Arents Research Collection at Syracuse University. GARCSU.

5. Parker, Jack T. "The Dream of NAPSAE." Focus on Public School Adult Education. First Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NAPSAE, a department of the National Education Association, 1961. pp. 13-20.

6. Ponitz, Henry J. "The FAE-NAPSAE Partnership." Focus on Public School Adult Education. First yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NAPSAE, a department of the National Education Association, 1961. pp. 21-26.

7. Public School Adult Education: A Guide for Administrators and Teachers. Washington, D.C. The National Association of Public School Adult Educators, a department of the National Education Association, 1956. p.ix. Revised edition, 1963. (Revised and reissued in 1969 as Administration of Continuing Education.)

8. McLernon, Thomas J. "Legislation, Certification, Salaries." Focus on Public School Adult Education. First Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NAPSAE, a

department to the National Education Association, 1961. pp. 94-105.

9. National Advisory Council on Adult Education. A History of the Adult Education Act. Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1980. p. 19.

10. NEA, Proceedings, 1964. p. 442.

11. National Association of Public School Adult Educators. The Pulse of Public School Adult Education 3:4. Washington, D.C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association. January 1963.

12. Jensen, Glenn S. "Adult Education Associations and Councils". Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Chicago, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960. Chapter 15, p. 187.

13. Adult Education Association collection, Box 1, correspondence, June 1, 1955. Letter from John H. Bigger to Malcolm Knowles. GARCSU.

14. National Association of Public School Adult Educators. The Pulse of Public School Adult Education 2:8. Washington, D.C.: the Association, April 1962. p.2.

15. National Association of Public Adult Education. Adult Basic Education: A Guide For Teachers and Teacher Trainers. (Originally published as A Guide for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education.) [Washington, D.C.:] the Association, a department of the National Education Association, 1969. 201 p. (Not sequentially numbered).

15. National Association of Public School Educators. The Pulse of Public School Adult Education 7:3. Washington, D.C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association. December 1966.

Chapter XII

THE NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORY IN GROUP DEVELOPMENT

Readers who have progressed this far will recognize the initials, NTL, as standing for what is now an internationally known program of training in interpersonal and intergroup relations based on research into the dynamics of group behavior. Acquiring skill in the practical application of these findings has become known as human relations training. It is generally understood to encompass the concepts of management training and professional development in profit and nonprofit settings with an emphasis on the improvement of interpersonal skills and intergroup relationships. Its trademark, although certainly not its only training method, is the Training Group (T-group), which permits individual participants to see and evaluate their own behavior and that of others in group situations.

NTL as an institution originated with NEA in 1947 and remained identified with the association until the retirement of its director, Leland P. Bradford, in 1970. After Bradford discontinued his work on the magazine Adult Leadership in April 1956, the date of his last contributed article, he devoted most of his time to the development and administration of NTL.

Getting Started

The importance of promoting effective intergroup and intragroup relationships is now generally well understood. The founders of NTL, however, had to contend with frequent waves of distrust and occasional ridicule. In a society highly oriented toward the importance of the individual, the bogeyman of a group-think culture intruded. The distinction between the need for specialized skills in some areas, and the importance of collaboration in other areas, clouded the thoughts of some. A frequently heard challenge was; "If you were to suddenly discover you had an attack of appendicitis would you wait for a group of physicians to assemble and only then permit the decision to be made as to when, and if, to operate?"

The role of the group observer, a training innovation that, when performed correctly, provided otherwise unobtainable insight into a group's own behavior was interpreted by some as a device invented to enable an unidentified "Big Brother" to examine what should be private. The language of group dynamics, drawn from psychology, social psychology, and sociology was judged by some people as jargon intended to confuse. The enthusiasm with which some embraced the new vistas a T-group provided, was at times so unrestrained that it gave rise to the charge by some critics that NTL was becoming a cult.

Part of the skepticism was justified. Some new arrivals from Bethel would delight in flaunting the new vocabulary.

"Feed-back," "hidden agenda," "back-home situation," "buzz groups," "change-agent," "flight/fight"--were all useful terms in their own right, but non-communicative to those who had no prior exposure. (I recall a training session conducted at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington where one officer eventually remarked that, while no one else considered it strange, he needed to learn why one person should give a "feedbag" to another). Untrained observers would hurt more than they would help when they either overwhelmed participants with too much "feedback" or focused on an individual's behavior in the group rather than on group functions.

Is Group Dynamics Adult Education?

As NTL's contribution to the processes of learning and leading became better understood the nit-picking gradually disappeared. A more complex issue within adult education circles was whether or not "group dynamics" was synonymous with "adult education." Although never the position of the governance of NTL or, so far as I know, any of its many adjunct staff members, Bradford spent nine years in an attempt to persuade the membership of the Department of Adult Education and later, of the AEA, that the mission of the "Lab" was, or should be, the mission of adult education. He had a certain amount of success in making converts. Initially, I was one. Thomas Van Sant, president of the Department of Adult Education was another.

Within AEA, Malcolm Knowles, the executive secretary, and Howard McClusky, the first president, both with top-level management and policy development responsibilities, quickly recognized the significance of process as a function of learning and of organizational growth and development. However, a readiness for a concentrated study of group behavior--or even a sustained exposure to applied group management techniques--grows out of a perceived need. For practioners, not only in adult education, but in many other occupations, the need for group awareness develops only after some level of competency has been attained in the performance of the specific skill requirements of a defined job.

Today, the fruits of the laboratory method of training can be described in part, in terms of the reeducation of some, and the continuing education of others, toward a deepened understanding of the use and misuse of authority; the role of perception in communication; the influence of both cognitive and emotional forces in the learning transaction; and the definition of leadership as a skill in helping direct change toward mutually agreed upon goals.

These, and other potential outcomes, did not emerge full-blown from the first laboratory in 1947 or from any of its immediate antecedents. In the staff meetings I attended in the early years of the Laboratory, I heard these and many other issues debated and discussed in depth. For them to suddenly become a part of the understanding of adult education practitioners en masse, or any other occupationally related group of workers, was impossible. What did happen during the final years of the Department, and the early years of AEA, was that many individuals in the adult education field acquired a useful arsenal of techniques. Role-playing, the generous use of newsprint, buzz groups, listening panels, observers, and "PMR's" (post meeting reaction forms), all gradually began finding increased use in faculty meetings, some classrooms, and other group meetings.

Where Bradford encountered difficulty in advancing his concepts beyond the technique level among many in the adult education field in the late forties and early fifties was in failure to recognize the pressures on practioners to meet minimum standards of job performance. This was particularly true for those whose responsibilities were mainly administrative. This included the vast majority of the members of first the NEA Department of Adult Education and later the AEA. Their most pressing responsibility was to plan programs that various needs assessment devices indicated were in demand and to select instructors who, in the absence of released time for in-service education, could be counted upon to teach specialized subject matter and yet be innately capable of understanding how to work with adults. In the fifties, it was not uncommon for the administrators of adult education programs at both the elementary-secondary level and the collegiate level, to be employed part-time--and there were always some who were new to the job.

Among other duties, administrators of adult education programs, both formal and informal, frequently were required to raise funds or to submit and resubmit budget requests to higher authorities. They often found it necessary to help make plans for new educational facilities, interpret their programs to members of the public, oversee the development of program brochures, and--on occasion--deal with a police officer who entered the office looking for a suspect among the student body--or the faculty. These were the ones to whom, "group dynamics" would have great appeal as a graduate course or a summer-time experience at Bethel, Maine. They looked to their professional associations to provide them with needed help in mastering the day-to-day mechanics of their job. The professional associations, in turn, had the responsibility of not only satisfying the technical demands of their members, but also of energizing them into a study of the meaning of continuing education and visualizing the potential of individuals to reach beyond their grasp in the search for growth and enlightment.

Bradford and FAE. Round Two

Unfortunately, Bradford found it difficult to demonstrate any great understanding of those who failed to see the field of knowledge in which he himself was an expert as the mainstay of adult education. In 1957, with the assistance of Paul Sheats, at the time a consultant to the Fund for Adult Education (FAE), Bradford invited Scott Fletcher and Robert Blakely to Bethel. The hope, of course, was "that they would become intrigued with the work we were doing and help support it."[1] When that did not happen, Bradford could not see that there was room for honest disagreement as to whether or not support for NTL fell within the scope of FAE's mission. Instead he turned bitter against the individual who had made possible AEA's publication of Adult Leadership. Bradford writes, "Scott Fletcher, who was as close to being a dictator as anyone I ever met, and about whom I wrote an article called "A Fundamental of Democracy", really did great harm to the adult education movement in this country in my opinion."[1]

In the article to which he referred,[2] written during the time of FAE's support of Adult Leadership, Bradford took to task "a man who undoubtedly considered himself a believer in democracy and a very democratic person." He then proceeded to build the case that the unnamed man is an authoritarian because, while he listens to the ideas and points of view of his subordinates, they are not involved in making the final decision.

Not having sat in on a meeting of Fletcher and his staff, I have no way of knowing the extent to which this was his method of operation. Even if it was, references to the FAE in the 1970 and 1990 handbooks of adult education (a comparable volume was not published in 1980) favorably record the Fund's contributions to the field. Obviously the members of the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE) viewed the contributions of FAE as highly significant. Equally so did the academics who made the most of the opportunity to initiate the "trainer of trainers" workshops supported by FAE before the Congress appropriated funds for this purpose. (See Chapter XI).

An ironic side-light of the Fletcher visit to Bethel was that Bradford himself came under attack by members of the summer staff for something comparable to the "undemocratic" behavior he attributed to Fletcher. "I remember with shame" he recalls, "the staff meeting after they [the FAE representatives] left, in which the newer and younger members of the staff tore the rest of us apart in terms of discrepancy between the values we held and our bowing and humble behavior before the Fund people."[2]

In 1956 a similar situation developed at Bethel. Bradford reports that he was called a day or so in advance

> ... and advised that a writer and photographer [from Business Week] were coming.... I made an administrative decision to go ahead. There was little time to call a committee together, but the staff and delegates were informed by announcements in their mailboxes.... The tongue lashing that I received was reminiscent of the one given me after the Ford Foundation (sic) visit in 1951. Expressions that staff would never come again [and] that they should decide whether magazines should be allowed to carry stories.... Unrealistic as some of these points were, they spoke to the anger of various staff members and the growing problems of transition from a non-organization to an organization faced with survival.[3]

Rather than trying to understand why most adult educators thought adult education was adult education--not applied social psychology--Bradford tar-brushed the entire field. He was convinced that "adult educators were the most resistant of all fields of education to Lab methods (with educators generally more resistent to change than any other fields.) Strong enemies [unnamed], plus the natural fear of adult educators to try any new innovations, so insecure were their positions, prevented much impact of NTL on the field." After then dismissing the adult education program at the University of Chicago as having "had the outstanding opportunity to develop broad-gaged adult education but [never] moving its definition of liberal adult education much beyond the 'Great Books' he concludes that "it is my sad judgement that the United States lags behind most other countries in adult education in terms of innovation in teaching, and this is where I personally feel failure, although NTL has affected adult education in several other countries."[*][4]

The Division of Adult Education and NTL

Bradford's disillusionment with the NEA was equally great. While always grateful for the support given to him by Willard Givens, NEA's executive secretary during the period 1945-1952, and Lyle Ashby, first an assistant executive secretary and then deputy secretary, he had little tolerance for members of the staff who "did not think I was working on a tangential program to regular adult education."[5]

In May 1957 at a meeting of the Program and Planning committee of NTL, Bradford notes that it was "recommended that NTL become a separate Division of NEA, an event not to take place for six more years."[6] Even earlier he and I had many discussions on this and, beginning about 1955, I urged the separation on the basis that in most respects it was almost a fait accompli. The operation of two distinct functions within the Division generated unnecessary confusion as we participated together in NEA staff meetings, made up internal budget allocations and staff assignments, and perplexed foreign visitors with our differing descriptions of adult education in the United States.

---

[*] However, in his essay on adult education in the 14th edition (1956) of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Cyril Houle, professor of adult education at the University of Chicago, said "a number of attempts to develop a more vital approach [to adult education] were initiated, the most significant being the group dynamics movement, in which the key figure was Leland Bradford.[7]

At first Bradford resisted efforts to move the Laboratory outside the Division. It is my opinion this early resistance to a change in the status quo was based on an unnecessary apprehension that any boat rocking might result in NTL being requested to leave the NEA. Bradford's assessment of his position within NEA after 1953 when William G. Carr succeeded Willard Given as executive secretary was that he "gave me no support during the fifteen years of his tenure, decided to bury NTL in the Division of Adult Education [where it had originated and of which Bradford himself was the director], and fought its separation from the adult education division"[5] This account fails to acknowledge that Carr did visit the Laboratory during one of its summer sessions to see for himself what the sessions were like and what the program sought to achieve. Nor does it acknowledge that NTL did acquire its desired status as a separate unit in 1962, five years before Carr retired in 1967.

Bradford considered the action taken in 1962 as NTL having "won its battle with NEA to be separated from the Division...."[8] In commenting on this part of Bradford's history, Carr said he "recalled no 'battle' and no surrender."[9] A review of the minutes of the NEA Board of Directors and Executive Committee for the years 1960-62 indicate that the proposal to separate NTL from the Division first reached the Executive Committee in March of 1960. Action was deferred until the October meeting. First a staff committee and then a joint committee drawn from the members of NTL and NEA governance developed recommendations for the Executive Committee. Before a final decision was made in July of 1962, proposals had been advanced to give NTL Departmental status, to keep the unit intact but appoint an associate director for public school adult education, and to establish an Organization for the Advancement of the Behavioral Sciences. Discussions were held on whether or not NEA policy would preclude NTL from entering into a partnership with a university and/or establishing branches on the campuses of various universities.

After NTL left the Division of Adult Education, the freedom of the adult education side of the office to operate on a number of different fronts was never questioned. A major contract was signed with the Job Corps, an agency of the Department of Labor, and smaller ones with the then U.S. Office of Education and the National University Extension Association. Many short-term contracts for consultative services were routinely made with a number of state departments of education.

In spite of NEA's considerable commitment to NTL's financial security, it was often difficult for Bradford to give full credit to the Association for having had much of a part in NTL's origin and continuing success other than that it was of "value for NTL to be under the umbrella of a large respectable organization such as the NEA, which then lent respectability to our innovations."[10]

In February 1952, the NEA Executive Committee granted "a leave of absence without pay from February 15 to June 15 for Lee Bradford, director of the Division of Adult Education Service... [to] do some writing in the Adult Education Field."[11] Bradford described the completed product as follows: "During 1953 the first major publication was produced by NTLGD and named Explorations in Human Relations Training: An Assessment of Experience 1947-1953. It sold widely. Jack Gibb and I wrote most of it."[12] In Chapter I, he reports that NTL is

> ... jointly sponsored by the Division of Adult

> education Service of the National Education Association, and the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan.... The major financial support for the activities of the Laboratory has come from a grant of $100,000.00 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to cover training and research operations for a three-year period that began January 1, 1950.[13]

No reference is made however, to the even larger, and longer-range financial commitment of the NEA. From 1945 to 1952 budget allocations for the Division amounted to $192,093. Assuming half of the allocation was directed to support "adult education" activities and one-half to the planning and management of NTL from 1945 through 1952, the NTL portion of the NEA contribution would have been $96,000. In addition, the NEA provided at no cost during this entire period, rent and other basic services not reflected in the Division's budget plus retirement contributions and fringe benefits, a budget which grew in size each year.

In 1967 NTL further increased its independence and autonomy and became, as part of an overall NEA reorganization, an

"Associated Organization".[*]

The NTL Institute For Applied Behavioral Science

The action authorizing the establishment of NTL as an autonomous unit was developed by a Joint Committee of NEA and NTL. On October 13, 1967 the committee proposed at a meeting of the NEA Board of Directors which Carr attended "that a new organization be established and incorporated to be named the NTL INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE, ASSOCIATED WITH THE NEA. It is further proposed that the NEA continue to give support to the part of NTL serving NEA and public school education [largely consultation and staff assistance on training programs for state and local association leadership] and that the Joint Committee be charged with working out details of the changing relationship."[14]

One of the details requiring attention was the disposition of property in the town of Bethel that the NEA owned and in which both NEA and NTL had invested funds. The eventual agreement provided that the NEA would give NTL NEA's financial stake in what was called the Conference Center. In a bookkeeping transaction, NEA transferred to NTL $23,921.21 to be used by NTL for the purchase of NEA's share of the ownership. In return it was

---

[*] For a description of the NEA reorganization and its effect on all semi-autonomous units within NEA, including NAPSAE, see Chapter XIV.

> ... understood that the Institute will provide 16 to 18 scholarships per year on a continuing basis ... [and that] educational services of the nature currently being provided to the NEA by the NTL be continued by the Institute under contract at the level budgeted for such service from time-to-time. It is the intent of the NEA that the Institute be treated to the fullest extent feasible as if it were a department for purposes of housing, retirement, fringe benefits, accounting, mailing and like services."[15]

Pluses and Minuses

In the short run, Bradford's determination to use the annual conferences of the Department of Adult Education as experimental groups for the development of the Work Conference concept inhibited the natural growth and influence of the Association over a five year period. His influence in helping establish Adult Leadership as, what was seen by many as a largely NTL oriented publication, had the effect of alienating a portion of the membership of the Adult Education Associaton without replacing it with a new constituency that could be counted upon for membership renewal.

His perception that NEA support for NTL was weakened at the time the executive leadership of the NEA changed from Willard

Givens to William Carr may, perhaps, be explained by the differences in Givens' and Carr's approach to management. Those who knew Givens better than did I, describe him as what might be termed a "relaxed" administrator. He did not wish to be over-involved in details and required few reports from his staff. Carr, on the other hand, delegated authority but more closely monitored performance. Whatever the explanation, the financial reports of NEA show that each year both NTL and the adult education functions of the Division continued to receive increased appropriations. Most, if not all, of NTL's organizational objectives were met and, gradually, more and more members of the governing bodies of NEA acquired an understanding of the meaning of NTL and of adult education--and greater recognition of where the objectives of the two programs overlapped and where they differed.

In the long run, he could not but have been gratified with the acknowledgement made of his contributions to adult and to elementary and secondary education, along with those made to business, industry, religious organizations, social work and other fields. Had he written his NTL history five years later, say in 1979, as he and his wife were working on their book, _Retirement_: _Coping With Emotional Upheavals_,[16] he might have judged less harshly the leadership of those engaged in the systematic, organized education of both young people and adults.

In Stubblefield and Keanes' chapter on the history of adult education in the 1990 Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education, NTL is credited with "making progress in charting new directions in adult resocialization, analyses of adult situations, participative techniques of learning, and a dynamic interpretation of adult learning behavior."[17] It is unlikely in the 100 or so graduate programs in adult education in this country, that few--if any students leave without being introduced to the theoretical framework of group process or sharing in participative learning techniques as part of their instruction. A quick look at the disorganized seating arrangements following a presentation at many of the "concurrent sessions" at the annual meetings of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education indicates that many of the meetings were obviously anything but platform centered.

A similar story can be told about the lasting effects of NTL influence within NEA and on organized education generally. Concepts and methods that NTL initiated are embedded in the curriculum of the present-day NEA Training Office. Its leadership development programs offered to the more than 1,000 organizational leaders in all parts of the country at state, local, and national levels, has contributed much to the continued vitality of NEA in its 135th year.

At the level where it counts most, in the classroom, a walk through nearly any modern school with well trained teachers will provide evidence that student involvement in the learning process is taking place. While most classroom instructors may not be aware of the historical and theoretical foundations of the practices they employ, the Bradfords, the Lippitts, the Bennes and the many others who shared in the development of NTL have every right to claim a part in the onset of many modern teaching procedures.

The Odd Couple

Many of the colleagues at NEA whom Bradford and I both knew often acknowledged the significant contribution NTL was making to an understanding of how people learned and worked together in an interactive situation. This expression of support would often be followed by the question as to whether or not NTL's contribution might have been greater, or realized sooner, if it had sprung forth in an environment expressly designed for experimental research rather than in a national teachers organization. Some supporters of NTL itself shared this opinion. In the early sixties, Bradford notes, "there was some questioning [by the NTL Executive Committee] as to whether NTL should stay with NEA" ... and that in 1961 ... " a bombshell was the invitation made by the

University of Michigan to move NTL to Ann Arbor"[18] the home of the Survey Research Center.

To defuse the bomb, a three-part committee was appointed. Four of the members were from the NEA, five from the University of Michigan, and six--including Bradford--from NTL. The Committee held four meetings. "Throughout all the discussions it was recognized that at that point NEA contributed nearly $50,000 annually to NTL".[19][*] The committee concluded it wise to continue NTL's identification with NEA but out of its deliberations sprang the forces that led to NTL becoming a separate unit in 1962--and in 1967, to the formation of an "associated organization" known as the NTL Institute of Behavioral Science.

One consideration in the decision to retain NTL's organizational affiliation with NEA was concern over whether or not the same wide range of university cooperation, an important feature of NTL's organization, could be maintained if a single university became the focal point. Also a consideration was

---

[*] A slight exaggeration. The budget allowance for the Adult Education Division at the time was $85,000. Since 1952, with the organization of the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, agreements within the Division assured that the number of employees paid by NEA, working on NTL matters, and reporting directly to Bradford would be the same as the number assigned to work with me on adult education programs. Similarly, that part of the budget allocated to travel and other services was evenly divided. Both NTL and adult education had, of course, substantial, additional resources from earned income and grants.

Bradford's quite understandable wish to continue his participation in the NEA retirement program and maintain his place of residence in Washington D.C. until his planned retirement in 1970.

The question remains, what were the circumstances that led to the development of an institution like NTL in an organization like NEA? As recounted in Chapter II, at the time Bradford was being interviewed for a position within NEA he was engaged in planning and designing training programs for the Federal Security Agency (FSA). The first target of his efforts at FSA was the Marine Hospital on Staten Island. There he was engaged in "trying to link the various levels of the hospital in determining problems and setting goals, by working with each group and getting permission from each level to tell other levels what problems they saw."[20] Later, at St. Elizabeth Hospital in Washington, he initiated training programs "without much success" where "each building behaved like an outpost under attack." He describes it "as one of the most fascinating yet difficult intergroup problems I ever faced."[21] By the time he began working at NEA he was, as described earlier, in close communication with both Ronald Lippitt and Kenneth Benne, key members of the team that would be instrumental in developing NTL's program.

It is not unreasonable to conjecture that at the time Willard Givens interviewed Bradford for the position open at NEA that Bradford was overflowing with enthusiasm for his present work; his involvement with a WPA Adult Education Project but a distant memory.

For his part, Givens may have been captivated at the prospect of improving, with Bradford's help, not only intergroup relationships within the NEA but the many meetings that were held everyday not only in Washington but across the country. This is not to imply that serious staff problems existed or that the various parts of the NEA remotely resembled outposts struggling for survival. Far from it. But one of Willard Givens' great gifts, and an important factor in his accomplishment of building NEA membership from nearly 200,000 to nearly 500,000 in his 17 year tenure, was his ability to anticipate the future and to make maximum use of the resources available to him. The size of the NEA staff had increased in proportion to the growth of the membership and was destined to grow even larger.

I did not know Givens well enough to discuss with him the challenges encountered in being secretary of a large national organization. Several of his successors have said that coordinating the work of a multiplicity of divisions, departments, committees and commissions, plus a Board of

Directors, a Board of Trustees, and an Executive Committee took both skill and patience.

The prospect of having on his staff an individual who had experience in dealing with intergroup and inter-organizational problems--and who also had ideas on how to make meetings more productive, and possibly even less numerous and shorter, must have appealed to him. As history unfolded, Bradford did assist with the planning and leadership development of some features of the 1949 NEA Convention in Boston but, generally speaking, his personal contributions to NEA personnel development and meeting planning were limited.

A Summing Up

During the time Bradford and I worked closely with the membership of the Department of Adult Education, and as a part of the team that helped fashion the AEA, I often sensed that Bradford saw himself becoming a new and different Morse Cartwright. As the leader of the American Association for Adult Education for twenty-three years, Cartwright had established for himself in this country and abroad, an image as the living symbol of adult education. Bradford was different from him in every respect except that, behind a gentle and unassuming personality, was the never-ending drive to free himself from the authority of others and to climb to the pinnacle of his profession. In retrospect I have come to the conclusion that the reason he undertook the losing effort to advance his personal interest under the cloak of adult education was for no more compelling reason than that the words "adult education" were in his job title. (In the Bradfords' book on retirement, Martha Bradford refers to her husband's visits to adult education programs in Europe as "part of a second career he was then engaged in while he was building the training laboratories.")[21]

That Bradford could not become a later day "Mr. Adult Education" was not because of any lack of ability. It was because his interest in that field of work was not sufficiently strong for him to be perceived by other adult educators as one of their own--or his being able to identify with them on equal terms. Once he modified his perception of the field in which his contribution was being made, he quickly became an internationally known behavioral scientist.

Obviously, Bradford and I accumulated a mountain of differences as our interests branched in different directions. Did these differences effect our personal relationship. No, they did not. After NTL became a separate entity within NEA we saw each other less frequently but our relationships were always cordial. In 1964, two years after the Division of Adult Education and NTL had gone their separate ways, Bradford presented me with a copy of T-group Theory and Laboratory Method[22] of which he was lead editor. The inscription read, "With deep appreciation for the many wonderful years of friendship and high adventure in the field of adult education."

I have not reread the book since receiving it, but the sight of the volume remains an almost daily reminder of the warmth of our friendship, our ability to never permit differences of opinion to influence our appreciation of each other's worth, and the exhilaration of the high adventure.

Chapter XII

REFERENCES

1. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History, 1947-1950. Bethel, Me., 1974. p. 75.

2. Bradford, Leland P. "A Fundamental of Democracy." Adult Education Bulletin 16:146-149; April 1952.

3. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History, 1947-70. op. cit. p. 100.

4. Ibid. p. 80.

5. Ibid. p. 78.

6. Ibid. p. 111.

7. Houle, Cyril O. "Adult Education." Encylopaedia Britannica, 14th edition. Chicago: Encylopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1956, Vol. I. p. 184-186.

8. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History 1947-70. op.cit. p. 159.

9. Interview with William G. Carr. Washington, D.C., June 10, 1990.

10. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories. Its History 1946-70. op. ct. p. 223.

11. NEA Proceedings. 1952. p.237.

12. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories. Its History 1947-70. op. cit. p. 81.

13. [Bradford, Leland P.; and Gibb, Jack R.] Explorations in Human Relations Training, 1947-58. [Washington, D.C.] National Training Laboratory in Group Development, [Division of Adult Education Service, National Education Association] 1953. p. 7

14. NEA Proceedings, 1967. p. 320.

15. Ibid. p. 294.

16. Bradford, Leland P. and Bradford, Martha D. Retirement: Coping With Emotional Upheavals. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1979. 202 pp.

17. Stubblefield, Harold W.; and Keane, Patrick. "The History of Adult and Continuing Education." Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. Chapter 3, p. 35.

18. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories. Its History. 1947-70. op.cit. p. 139.

19. Ibid. p. 140.

20. Ibid. p. 26.

21. Bradford, Leland P. and Bradford, Martha O. op. cit., p. 66.

22. Bradford, Leland P.; Gibb, Jack R.; and Benne, Kenneth D. T-group Theory and Laboratory Method. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1964. 498 pp.

Chapter XIII

INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH

Adult educators in the United States recall the 1920's as the decade in which adult education began the metamorphosis from a collection of notable, but isolated, activities into an organized movement in which the parts found it useful to communicate with the whole. The twenties also marked the introduction into general use of the term "adult education" under which all forms of learning on the part of adults, formal and informal, could be grouped. In the United States, a significant landmark along the way toward greater interdependence among the members of a new occupational force was the founding of the Department of Adult Education.

This birds-of-a-feather inclination had its international counterpart. Despite the resurgence of isolationist political sentiment in the United States following the conclusion of World War I, other parts of the society, notably the members of literary, professional, and scientific groups felt the need to cross international and intercontinental boundaries to advance and reinforce their common interests.

Early in the century, some labor organizations sensed the importance of identifying with the word "international" in strengthening and adding prestige to a common cause. This contributed to the creation in 1919 of the International Labor Organization (ILO), affiliated with the League of Nations, although independent of it. The ILO led the way in demonstrating the importance of speaking with an international voice in setting standards, advancing a special interest, and providing needed services. In 1929 the International Federation of Library Associations was founded to promote international cooperation. Private voluntary associations covering interests ranging from air transport to university extension continue to operate effectively on the international stage in promoting what they see as necessary and right in strengthening the goals of their national constituencies.

Adult education was not left behind in the surge toward generating an international cohesion of interests. In August 1929, the first World Conference of Adult Education was held. Four hundred and ten persons from forty countries attended some or all sessions of a week-long meeting in Cambridge, England. The participants represented "practically all the principal states of Continental Europe (except Russia) ... many widely separated sections of the British Commonwealth ... [and] China, Japan, Iceland, Mexico, and the United States."[1]

As would be expected, those present decided to form an international organization named the World Association for Adult

Education. However, the Association "never really came alive as an international organ, since its membership was composed largely of individuals, in the absence of effective national organizations in most of the countries from which they came."[2] Although supported in part by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation through the American Association for Adult Education, the Association did not last beyond 1933. In that year it held its final meeting at the Borups Folk High School in Copenhagen. "The world-wide depression, it was explained, had resulted in decreases in financial support of various national groups and supporting bodies to a point where a continuance of the normal [operation] was dangerous if not impossible."[3]

The NEA and International Organizations

International congresses of educators in which the NEA had played a part had been held in the United States as early as 1876. However, leadership on the part of NEA in initiating international collaboration did not get under way until 1923. In that year the NEA sponsored a world conference held in San Francisco in conjunction with the meeting of its Delegate Assembly. Out of this would emerge the World Federation of Education Associations. The Federation met seven times at two-year intervals in Great Britain, the United States, Canada, and Japan. By 1939, the organization had lost its momentum and, with the advent of a second world war, disappeared as an active voice in international deliberations on education.

After the war, in 1945, under the leadership of William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA-AASA Educational Policies Commission, the drive toward stimulating and coordinating professional communication beyond national boundaries was revived. As he describes it

> ... on the day President Truman signed the UNESCO Constitution, the NEA announced that it was inviting the representatives of the national teachers' organizations in other countries to a conference in Endicott, N.Y., which would consider, among other agenda items, how teachers could cooperate with the newly-formed intergovernmental educational organization of UNESCO. The meeting included 56 delegates from 38 major teachers' organizations of 28 countries....[4]

The most significant outcome of the conference was the design it produced for the World Organization of the Teaching Profession (WOTP). An innovative by-product was the first trial use of a small portable radio receiver for simultaneous interpretation.... According to Carr, the new equipment, developed by IBM, needed "testing under working conditions. We were glad to supply the working conditions in return for the free use of the equipment."[5]

One of the principal challenges facing the new organization was the need to bridge the organizational separateness of elementary and secondary school teachers that was common in many European countries. This was accomplished in large part by adoption of the concept of "confederation." With this hurdle surmounted, the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP) came into being in 1952. Carr, soon to be named executive secretary of the NEA and a determined worker for international cooperation, was named secretary general. He held this position for fifteen years followed by two years as president.

The Soviet controlled nations continued to remain apart and organized their own international organization of teachers.

As was true of the NEA itself, the primary objective of WCOTP was to represent the interests of teachers of children and teachers of youth. The first direct introduction of WCOTP delegates to concepts of adult education was in 1956 when the assembly met in Manila. The theme of that conference was "The Teachers and the Well Being of Society". Rather than merely talking about the teachers' role in serving society, the delegates were taken on field trips to observe the Philippine community-center schools in action."[*]

Another exposure to adult education, and to the lack of it, came with the naming of William F. Russell, president of Teachers College, Columbia University, to serve as deputy director of the United States Agency for International Development (AID). As a member of the Advisory Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, Carr undertook an inspection tour of the educational operations of the AID mission in the Caribbean, Central America, and Asia. In El Salvador, "we found that illiteracy in the adult population was nearly two-thirds. Seventy percent of the primary school teachers had neither degrees nor diplomas from the primitive normal schools."[7] In Taiwan he reported that "we were impressed by the developing rural school curriculum closely related to the needs of the community and its people. The remarkable rate of growth in GNP ... during the past 15 years or so is, in considerable part, due to improved education."[8]

Not withstanding the obvious relationship between a rising

---

[*] "The schools of the Philippines have long been identified with adult education.... The conversion in 1947 of the former Office of Adult Education into the Division of Adult Education of the Bureau of Public Schools further intensified the participation of the schools in adult education. Since then the program of adult education in the Philippines has become an integral function of the Bureau of Public Schools.... The schools have ... the following objectives: the eradication of illiteracy [and] ... the improvement of community life in all its aspects, through the provision of vocational, recreational, social, and other educational opportunities for adults....[6] "

GNP and an educational program that made provision for preparatory, remedial and community educational opportunity, no mechanism for articulating and pursuing these concepts existed within WCOTP until an adult education committee was organized in 1959. In that year WCOTP held its annual assembly in Washington, D.C. In anticipation of the event, Bradford wrote to Scott Fletcher, president of the Fund for Adult Education (FAE), pointing out "there is no world-wide organization of adult educators to facilitate the exchange of experience or spread influence from one country to another." As a means of filling this communication void, Bradford said he thought "it important that a free forum be established by the free world in which effective programs of adult education can be reviewed and discussed." He further stated that:

> WCOTP has suggested to our Division of Adult Education Service ... that it would be possible for a council of adult education organizations or a committee of adult educators from various parts of the world to have a role within the large WCOTP organization.... This would provide the most effective possible instrument to make more certain that adult education throughout the world be more comprehensive than would otherwise be the case.

To begin the implementation of the idea he submitted a request for $5,000 to "hold a conference on adult education composed of selected leaders from many nations." The conference was to be held immediately in advance of the WCOTP Assembly in Washington. The grant would provide "for the expenses of those key adult educators in various countries who should be present but who could not otherwise come."[9]

The FAE did make the grant but in further negotiations it was understood that transportation costs could only be paid for adult educators within the United States who might be invited to serve as consultants. At the suggestion of Robert Blakely, it was further agreed that the five national organizations in the United States whose major clientele represented adult educators be invited to send two representative each to the conference at their own expense.

Of the 86 registered participants, fully half were from over-seas, most of whom would be attending the WCOTP Assembly immediately following the adult education conference. A number of those attending from Africa and from Asia had their expenses to the WCOTP meeting paid by proceeds from grants to WCOTP from foundations.

The adult education conference was a well-planned work conference which made frequent use of small discussion groups in clarifying objectives and developing the steps required for implementation. The final outcome was a request to WCOTP to appoint an Adult Education Commission (changed by WCOTP to read "Committee") charged with responsibility "to emphasize to all teachers and teachers' organizations ... the values of adult education for their own professional growth." The Committee was also enjoined "to bring all teachers and administrators into association with their colleagues in the various fields of adult education, such as university extension, public schools, rural education, workers education, libraries, and so forth."[10] *

Within a few days the WCOTP Assembly of Delegates unanimously agreed to establish an Adult Education Committee and, at its final session, adopted a Resolution which stated in part "that continuing education become a public responsibility and an integral part of all educational programs."[11]

J. Roby Kidd of Canada, director of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and a leading figure in international education was elected the Committee's chair. Leland Bradford was named secretary and the headquarters for the committee were placed in the office of the Division of Adult Education Service.

---

*It is obvious it was Bradford's hope that the WCOTP Committee would not be limited to representatives of the public school establishment but broadly representative of the entire field of adult education. Although the membership of the Committee appointed at Washington was diversified, future committees named by WCOTP governance were largely limited to representatives of WCOTP member organizations.

William Van Orman, the consultant in public school adult education on the Division's staff assisted Bradford in the organization of the conference. Together with his secretary, Dora Passalacqua, Van Orman was responsible for the final report published in French, Spanish, and English.

The 1949 Unesco Conference

The first Unesco sponsored Conference on Adult Education was convened in Elsinore, Denmark in 1949. At that time representatives of the NEA Division of Adult Education and of other national organizations with an interest in adult education had been invited by the United States Department of State to meet with the delegation before its departure. There can be little doubt, however, that both the composition of the delegation and its position on most adult education issues reflected the influence of the American Association for Adult Education. The minutes of the AAAE International Relations Committee for october 21, 1948 read:

> The members of the committee felt that because of the direct relationship that the American Association for Adult Education has not only to the U.S. National Commission for Unesco but to Unesco and its Paris Secretariat, the Commission should concern itself primarily with plans for the International Conference projected for 1949 and with

> proposals to be presented for the creation of an international organization in adult education....[12]

The delegation from the United States represented evening colleges, university extension, agricultural extension, education for the Negro, and workers education.

The U.S. Delegation was firmly of the opinion that a world-wide organization would be an outcome of the conference. Instead, the conference recommended that the position of adult education within Unesco be strengthened. As a result, a consultative committee was established at Unesco to advise the adult education staff. Unesco-supported projects were then begun in workers' education, community development, and fundamental education. The choice of projects represented prevailing opinion in many European countries, and to a considerable extent within this country, that adult education activities should be undertaken independently of already established instruments of education.

The 1960 Unesco Conference

By 1960 the direction of adult education had changed considerably both in the United States and abroad. Internationally, there was increased recognition that adult education must be a part of, not separate from, national systems of education. In this country, whereas Bradford had considered, justly in my opinion, that the Department had been shut out of exercising any but the most minimal influence on the 1949 conference, the opposite was true ten years later. Backed by the leverage of WCOTP and the formation within NEA of an association of public school adult educators, NEA's influence was particularly strong. I had been named one of the members of the U.S. delegation representing public school adult education and Bradford attended as an accredited, non-governmental observer for WCOTP.

A week in advance of the Montreal conference the WCOTP committee met for five days at McDonald College near Montreal. The purpose of the meeting was to plan a strategy for reinforcing within each of the three conference commissions the committee's positions. First and foremost was the principle of including the public education authority as a key player in adult education planning. Second (and unsuccessfully) to move once again for the establishment of a world adult education association. Although the importance of building public education into the implementation of adult education goals was an idea whose time had come, the easy acceptance of this position at Montreal can be said to have come about, to a considerable extent, because of the influence of the WCOTP Adult Education Committee.*

Expressions of hope did arise at Montreal that one result of the conference would be the formation of a voluntary, non-governmental world association of adult educators. The delegates, however, deferred to the preference of Unesco and voted for the formation, and/or strengthening, of regional associations in the various geographical areas of the world.

The Soviets did send a delegation to Montreal but, although the United States Delegation was briefed in depth before its departure on the probability of the USSR delegates seeking to generate an international incident, no such event happened. Most of the members of the Soviet delegation spoke English, some also spoke French, and a spirit of high international solidarity prevailed throughout the conference. That I had spent three weeks in the Soviet Union the year before making a quick study of adult education in four of the Republics[14] enhanced the cordial relationship I was able to establish with each member of the delegation.

---

*In 1962 WCOTP met in New Delhi, Prior to the Assembly, the Adult Education Committee organized an adult education conference in cooperation with the Indian Adult Education Association. One of the speakers was Arnold S. Hely, director of the Department of Adult Education at the University of Adelaid in South Australia. Hely had not attended the Washington conference but did attend the meeting of the committee at McDonald College and was a delegate to the Unesco meeting. In his address at New Delhi, Hely said, "that in his opinion, the McDonald meeting had considerable impact on the deliberations of the World Conference,"[13]

The legitimate need of representatives of similar interests to have an opportunity to meet together was not neglected. Either prior to the Unesco meeting, or immediately following, six of the sub-parts of the adult education complex had arranged international meetings of their own. In addition to the meeting of the WCOTP Adult Education Committee, other interest areas holding meetings were those representing residential education, technical assistance, university extension, audio-visual education, and labor education.

One of these meetings resulted in the founding of the International Congress of University Adult Education. Thirty-five individuals, many of whom had attended the Unesco conference, traveled to the Sagamore Conference Center of Syracuse University to hear and discuss papers presented on ways for advancing university adult education. The Fund for Adult Education, which had contributed to the Washington WCOTP meeting the year before, also provided support for the university meeting.

On the final day of the Sagamore conference a plan was adopted for the formation of an International Congress of Adult Education. An impressive array of publications, regional conferences, and other information sources was soon initiated including the first of a series of international conferences on comparative education.

The WCOTP and Adult Education

In the fifteen years following the New Delhi meeting the Adult Education Committee held conferences in advance of the WCOTP Assembly in every year except 1969. The NEA through its Division of Adult Education Service, beginning in 1962, supported the Committee by providing the time and the overseas travel expense of the Committee's secretary. Because of summer commitments to the National Training Laboratories and disappointment over the failure of the Montreal conference to found an international adult education association, Bradford did not attend the New Delhi meeting. He resigned as chair of the committee prior to its next meeting in Stockholm. His place was taken by Thomas J. McLernon, an assistant director of the Division.

McLernon had held the position of an associate in adult education in the New York State Department of Education. He therefore had a ready-made identification with the now sharply defined focus (public school adult education) of the Committee that had came into view following the Montreal meetings. When McLernon left the Division in 1964 I was appointed secretary. Because of other commitments on my part, Richard Cortwright of the Division's staff served as the secretary of the Committee when it met in Dublin in 1968.

Liaison with Unesco

At the WCOTP Assembly in Addis Ababa in 1965, a special plenary session was held on WCOTP's role in literacy programs. The session was addressed by Aser Deleon, the Director of the Department of Adult Education and Youth Activities of Unesco. Also in 1965, a special investigation was undertaken by WCOTP with the financial and technical assistance of Unesco in Kenya and Thailand on the practicability of involving the teaching profession in literacy and adult education. A summary of the study, plus other reports on the work of WCOTP member organizations in literacy education was published by WCOTP in 1966 with the assistance of a grant from UNESCO.[15] In 1967 William C. Carr was appointed by the director-general of Unesco to an international Consultative Committee for Literacy. In the same year I was sent by WCOTP on special assignment to Tanzania to consult with the special task force from the United Nations Special Fund, meeting in Tanzania, for the purpose of assessing the feasibility of a proposed United Nations Special Fund literacy project in the Lake Region of Tanzania.

Involvements of this kind continued through 1975 when, as a result of the reorganization of the NEA (discussed in Chapter

XIV), the NEA discontinued its direct financial support of the Committee. The NEA does, however, continue its membership in WCOTP, contributes substantially to its support, and regularly sends a strong delegation to the now, biennial meetings of the Assembly.

In most of the field assignments undertaken by the Adult Education Committee either for WCOTP directly, or for Unesco through WCOTP, members of the committee, usually drawn from members of the so-called developing countries, undertook the investigations. The opportunity this provided for some members of the committee to explore in depth both the problems and opportunities of literacy and adult education greatly strengthened the influence of the committee both within WCOTP and Unesco.

Thirty Years Later

In the 30 plus years that have elapsed since the first Unesco Conference on Adult Education and the establishment of the WCOTP Adult Education Committee, opportunities for adult and continuing education have rapidly increased around the globe. Concern about illiteracy has spread from a focus on its debilitating effect on Third World economic development to an equal concern about its proliferation in industrialized societies.

An International Council for Adult Education has at last been established (in 1973 with Roby Kidd as the first Secretary General). Opportunities for universal free schooling have multiplied. Yet, for all of this, the reportedly "successful" literacy campaigns in Cuba and Iraq have not led to peace and democracy. By 1970, Turkey had introduced compulsory primary school education as a hedge against future adult illiteracy but compliance could not be enforced. In the spring, in the rural areas, children could not attend classes because they were needed for planting. In the fall they were kept at home to help with the harvesting.

In the United States, the grim fact remains that twelve years of schooling, while it propels some toward higher education, for others it does little to remove them from the ranks of the functional illiterate.

Yet the hope for a realization of the goals expressed by adult educators in their international meetings in 1929, in 1949, in 1960, and regularly thereafter, have not dimmed the flicker of hope then ignited for progress toward a more enlightened citizenry. What has changed is a fuller realization of the underlying processes required to build a learning society. No one institution, and the pursuit of no one cause, can do the job alone. Schools, health and human service agencies, colleges and universities, family planning programs, churches and synagogues, the mercantile community, political parties, environmental interests and all the other groups that hold national and international meetings, solicit members, hold institutes and seminars, and publish useful journals, cannot remain independent of any other effort to raise the international level of enlightenment.

The task now facing adult educators is to sensitize all levels of society to a realization that the fragile structure of global survival can only be sustained by the construction of an interdependent learning community. It is unlikely that the steps toward this goal are any more clear at the time this is being written than in 1945 when the Unesco Constitution reminded the world that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men the defenses of peace must be constructed."

The determination to involve the minds of children and adults in constructing a learning society goes on. It is toward this task that adult educators will continue to devote themselves.

NTL International

In his chapter, "The Outreach"[16] in the history of NTL, Bradford first lists as beneficiaries of Laboratory influence industry, the church field, and community programs (YMCA, schools, higher education, government, and the military). Then follows a section on Regional Laboratories in various parts of continental United States and Puerto Rico.

The international section begins with a description of activities in Europe. Countries in which Laboratories or other forms of training had been established include England, Belgium, France, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, and Holland. In Asia, the laboratory method and other forms of sensitivity training have been introduced in Japan, the Philippine Islands, India, and Thailand. The principal country in Africa that is named in the account is Nigeria. Countries in South and Central America where the influence of NTL has been felt include Costa Rica, Columbia, Ecuador and Brazil.

The rapid spread of the Laboratory concept was the result of the consultatative and training visits of Laboratory staff members overseas and the introduction of laboratory methods back into the countries from which many delegates who participated in the summer training sessions at Bethel lived and worked.

Chapter XI of Bradford's history is must reading for all who are interested in the growth and extension of NTL. It is, in effect, a case study of the contagion effect of a well-planned, socially useful idea and of the institutional networking required to carry the idea across national borders. Bradford's summary of the chapter reads, in part:

> This brief scanning of the outreach of NTL in no way gives an adequate picture of its vast spread ... but it does indicate that NTL and its development of the experimental laboratory method of learning has touched and effected most occupational groups in this country and has been, and is, influential in every continent of the world. This has occurred in a brief quarter of a century, which is a remarkable achievement considering the extent to which it is antithetical to an educational method that has endured for a number of centuries.
>
> That this spread could occur so rapidly speaks to a changing world in which, as Huston Smith* states ..."the concept of man the knower is moving rapidly to man the being, relater to others, and knower of self."[17]

---

*At the time, professor of philosophy at MIT, and a staff member of the 1965 Bethel Laboratory.

Chapter XIII

REFERENCES

1. "The Clearing House: World Conference on Adult Education." Journal of Adult Education 1: 438; October 1929.

2. Peers, Robert. Adult Education: A Comparative Study. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. p. 247.

3. "The Clearing House: World Association For Adult Education." Journal of Adult Education 5:456; October 1933.

4. Carr, William G. The Continuing Education of William Carr. Washington D.C.: NEA, 1978. p. 118.

5. Ibid. p. 119.

6. Gaffud, Miguel B. "The Role of the Schools in Adult Education." Report on the Unesco Regional Seminar on the Role of Schools and Universities in Adult Education. Paris: Unesco, 1964. p. 104.

7. Carr. op.cit. p. 167.

8. Ibid. p. 171.

9. Letter to C. Scott Fletcher from Leland P. Bradford, February 26, 1959. Fund for Adult Education Grant to the National Association of Public School Adult Educators, Ford Foundation Archives, Reel 4754-Frame 2748.

10. National Education Association, Division of Adult Education Service. International Adult Education Conference. July 26-28, 1959. Washington D.C.: The Association, 1959. p. 5 of unnumbered section 7.

11. Ibid. p. 2. Unnumbered section 8.

12. Adult Education Association Collection, Box 6. Staff Minutes AAAE Folder, Minutes of the Committee on International Relations, October 21, 1948. George Arents Research Library for Special Collections at Syracuse University (GARLSU).

13. Luke, Robert A. WCOTP and Adult Education: A Historical

Report Prepared in Partial Fulfillment of a Grant from Unesco to WCOTP. [Washington, D.C.: NEA Division of Adult Education Service, 1971.] 5 p. (offset).

14. Luke, Robert A. "Total Education for a Totalitarian Society." Adult Leadership 8: 194-196; January, 1960.

15. [Luke, Robert A., editor]. The Teaching Profession and the World-Wide Literacy Programe. Washington D.C.: World Confederation of the Teaching Profession, [1201 16th St.] Washington, D.C. 20006, 1967. 34 p. (Published with Financial Assistance of Unesco).

16. Bradford, Leland P. National Training Laboratories: Its History: 1947-1970. Bethel, Me., 1974. Chapter XI, "The Outreach," pp. 203-222.

17. Ibid. p. 221.

Chapter XIV

TRANSITIONS

From its earliest years, platform presentations at the annual meetings of the National Teachers' Association frequently gave lip service to the importance of Americanization and literacy education. In 1871, the by then renamed National Educational Association's leadership cadre was predominately composed of school administrators, personnel from the "normal schools", and some representation from four-year colleges and universities.

NEA's first overt support for adult education began in 1921 in response to an emergency; a flood of immigrants to be "Americanized" and, to a lesser extent, the need to raise the skill-level of many native-born, semi-literate individuals who had moved into the towns from rural areas where a high level of literacy was less often a job requirement. NEA's support came in the form of small annual subsidies and contributed services to a voluntary organization, the Department of Immigrant Education.

Over the course of a half-century, the need for continuing education on the part of adults expanded and the terminology changed. The interest of the NEA grew with the years and over a half-century it helped support four associations of adult educators,[*] one of which had no formal or official ties with it. The case can be made that, had NEA not become a principal partner of the failing American Association for Adult Education (AAAE) in founding a successor organization, the Adult Education Association of the USA (AEA) might never have come into being.

Within NEA itself, in 1945 a second educational emergency involving adults had to be faced: the need to offer leadership to state and local school systems suddenly confronted with the responsibility of providing educational opportunities for returning service personnel who wished to pick up on interrupted schooling. The NEA's response was to create a fully staffed headquarter's unit--the Division of Adult Education Service. When the need for that kind of assistance had passed, the Division sought other avenues of expression and influence. This led to a divided program. Part of the Divisions's activity was directed toward providing needed staff assistance to the already existing Department of Adult Education. Later, that same assistance was made available to the AEA and finally to the National Association of Public School Adult Educators (NAPSAE). A second part of the Division's program was the beginning of an intensive study of group behavior and the quick emergence of the

---

[*] Counting the Department of Immigrant Education and the Department of Adult Education as two.

National Training Laboratory in Group Development (NTL).

In the first eight or nine years of the Division's history, the two were joined to the extent that two membership organizations--first the Department of Adult Education and then the AEA--served either as a part-time laboratory for the advancement of group study projects, or as a vehicle for the publication of the practical application of group study findings.

Because NTL could serve as only a narrow pathway between the accumulated knowledge of the social sciences, particularly social psychology and sociology, and the equally large and diverse field of adult education; a potential marriage of the two areas could, at best, be short-lived. The market for applied group dynamics was so universal it could not be contained within a single branch of any one established form of education. On the other hand, the organized field of adult eduction had so many facets and subparts that it could not focus solely on the methodology of the teaching-learning transaction.

In 1962, to the relief of much of the leadership within the adult education movement and, by then, to the relief of Leland Bradford as well, NTL was separated from the unit of the NEA in which it had been nurtured. As a separate unit, NTL was free, within such policy guidelines as NEA itself might impose (at the time, virtually none) to pursue its own agenda and develop its own governing structure. In that respect it acquired the same program flexibility and autonomy as that enjoyed by NAPSAE and the other departments. It was however, a privilege neither one would enjoy indefinitely. By 1970 NEA's entire program was remodeled and NAPSAE, NTL, the Division of Adult Education, and most other departments would be phased out of the NEA structure.

The Turbulent Sixties

The array of domestic problems besetting the United States in the sixties was not new. What was new was the organization and intensity of the voices demanding that the problems be addressed. The sixties saw a public awakening to the prevalence of urban and rural poverty and an increased awareness of the denial of civil rights to many classes of citizens. It also marked the war in Vietnam which deeply divided the American people. Teachers in the public schools and their employers were not exempt from the ensuing turmoil. A steady increase in population--and a shift in the population from east to west--left some schools overcrowded and understaffed and others neglected and poorly maintained. The assassination of the two Kennedys and Martin Luther King highlighted rising crime rates and a turning, on the part of some, toward violence as a means of solving, creating, or endeavoring to avoid problems. Teachers increasingly found themselves called upon to deal in their classrooms with much of the residue of social unrest. All this, of course, in addition to arranging the learning experiences for their students they had been professionally prepared to undertake.

At the 1968 meeting of the Representative Assembly both the NEA president, Braulio Alonso of Florida, and the NEA executive secretary, Sam Lambert, enumerated the new sets of problems facing teachers.[1] They also pledged to intensify the Association's efforts to attack not only the problems, but to strengthen teachers' hands in dealing with the problems. An office of legal counsel was established as well as a Center for Human Relations. A highly mobile and greatly expanded field staff was organized and steps taken toward building a "United Profession", i.e., individual members of the NEA would be required to also be a member of their state and local associations. A thorough reorganization of the staff was begun which would concentrate the Association's resources on a limited number of sharply defined problem areas.

As the NEA directed its future course more toward serving classroom teachers, it became clear that the Association would no longer remain a holding company for the many organizations that, in varying numbers, had been a unique part of its structure for more than 100 years. Some departments, the American Association of School Administrators for example, voluntarily withdrew. Its members found it incompatible to be part of an organization that was moving toward endorsing work stoppages as a means of backing up collective bargaining proposals. Others, the subject matter or special interest departments, of which NAPSAE was one, no longer fit into the NEA's overall program. Also adding to the pressure to discontinue the departmental structure was the understandable reluctance of many NEA members to continue paying dues toward the support of some departments that accepted the many services offered by the Association, but enrolled few members in the organization.

These actions did not mean teachers no longer were concerned with the development of skills and knowledge in subject areas, or deepening their understanding of human behavior. It did mean that NEA members now felt that to meet professional needs they should look to other resources: to national, state and local professional associations organized around subject matter and other special interests; to the short-term institutes of colleges and universities; to meaningful in-service education which they helped plan, and to the rapidly growing core of specialists in state departments of education.

Allan West, who served as associate, deputy, and acting executive secretary from 1964 to 1973 summarized the changing situation.

> In the early 1960s ... tensions began to be felt. Coordinating the efforts of more than thirty separate groups while dealing with issues demanding swift action was an impossible task. At the same time, the Representative Assembly became more and more concerned about the lack of support for NEA programs and lagging membership promotion by many departments. One member of a 1966 team studying the Association's structure observed that the NEA family resembled the definition once applied to a university: "a number of autonomous departments joined together by a common system of plumbing."[2]

Effect on NAPSAE and the Division

In 1968, at the meeting of the NEA Representative Assembly, an amendment to the NEA by-laws was passed which authorized the departments to maintain their ties with the association in one of three categories. These were described by Robert Finch, president of NAPSAE and director of adult education in Cincinnati, as follows:

1. Continuation as an **NEA Department**. This relationship would require NEA membership as a prerequisite for enrollment in **NAPSAE**.
2. Development of **NATIONAL AFFILIATE** status. This would

make it mandatory for all officers of NAPSAE to be members of NEA and for NAPSAE to systematically promote NEA membership among its other members.

3. Become an **ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATION**. In this relationship, NEA membership would be optional for NAPSAE officers and members.

Each loosening of the NEA membership requirement, however, loosens the obligation of the NEA to provide services and support. Support could range from nearly full or substantial support for departments to merely maintaining cooperative planning efforts and encouraging open channels of communication with the affiliated and associated organizations.[3]

At the NAPSAE annual business meeting in Seattle the following November, the membership voted to become a National Affiliate. This was the beginning of the end of NAPSAE's organizational ties with NEA. NTL had become an Associated Organization one year earlier.

At the meeting of the NEA Executive Committee on March 22, 1969 the members unanimously agreed that "former departments which have elected to be national affiliates, and where there has been commingling of funds in staff and services with Headquarters divisions, be notified that NEA contributions ... will be phased out in not more than a 3-year period."[4] Beginning July 1, a below market rate for rent and service began being levied and an unrestricted budget authorization was made to NAPSAE in the amount of $34,638. The amount was reduced to $23,100 in the 1970-71 budget and finally closed out the year following with an appropriation of $11,500.

In 1969 I was advised that if I wished to remain Director of the Division of Adult Education Service, it would be necessary for me to resign as Executive Secretary of NAPSAE. Great as was my loyalty to NAPSAE, it was not a difficult decision for me to make. I had been employed by the NEA for twenty years and believed strongly not only in what it had been, but in what it obviously was about to become. Furthermore, the assistant secretary, James Dorland, was as familiar with every aspect of the Department's work as was I and had the complete confidence of the NAPSAE Board. I reserved for myself the privilege of recommending him as the new secretary.

The Division of Adult Education Service continued operational through the next two years. Its staff; Richard Cortright, myself, and four support personnel was not reduced but we were charged with developing programs that would fit in with the newly defined NEA objectives. Among the tasks we undertook were serving as staff contacts for an NEA Task Force on Drug

Education, working with the NEA's Field Staff on what negotiating teams should know about adult education, assisting the recently organized Leadership Academy in its training programs for the officers of state and local associations, and continuing some Division projects that had been established prior to the 1969-70 budget year. Principally among these were the Service Bureau for Programs of Elementary and Secondary Education for Adults and work with the Adult Education Committee of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

At this time the NEA was not yet a "union" but the signs were unmistakable that the day was fast approaching when it would be. It would take a constitutional convention, held in Ft. Collins, Colorado in 1971, and two years of continuing committee work to bring about a fundamental change of that magnitude. While some of my colleagues on the NEA staff regretted continuing movement in that direction, I was among those who welcomed it. In 1970 I volunteered (I emphasize the word "volunteered") to be part of an NEA team supporting the teachers in Los Angeles who were on strike against the school board. For the first time in many visits to the city, I felt restrained against calling on any of my friends in the school administration office. It was not difficult, however, to seek out some teachers marching on the picket line who also taught in the adult program. To a person they were unanimous in their conviction that no conflict of interest existed. As day-school teachers they felt they had a grievance against the school administration. As teachers in the adult school and employed under a different contract, they had no complaints.

NEA's New Role in Instruction

During the summer of 1971 the Division of Adult Education Service and three other formerly independent units were merged into the newly created Division of Instruction and Professional Development (IPD). In addition to adult education, the other units were the Center for the Study of Instruction, Educational Technology, and the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.

Creation of the new unit coincided with the introduction of Program Budgeting as a means of assuring "that expenditures achieve the specific goals and objectives of the Association."[5] Six goal areas were established, the first of which was "an Independent, United Teaching Profession." The second was "Professional Excellence." Others had to do with economic security for teachers, adequate financing for public schools, human and civil rights, and leadership in solving social problems. The specific "objectives" established for IPD were largely in the second goal area.

Richard Cortright and I, plus members of the support staff of the former Division of Adult Education, were now part of a larger team. Our assignments continued to be varied, challenging, and professionally rewarding. Although we ventured into other fields, a majority of our work was in programs related to teachers negotiating for, and securing a role in planning, their own in-service education. While I considered myself still in the field of adult education, some of my former colleagues were not so sure.*

The Rise of the Community College

The shifting sands of organizational development within NEA were but part of the changing landscape of adult education in the sixties. As far back as 1952 when the NEA undertook its study of adult education in urban areas, it reported that

> Participation during a twelve-month period in continuing education programs offered adult citizens by public junior colleges is now nearly 400,000. This is

---

*In the fall of 1975 I was attending a conference of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education in New Orleans. At the same time NAPSAE was meeting in New York City. At a luncheon in New Orleans, one of the teacher education state directors said he was gratified that an "adult educator" was a member of the NEA in-service education team. When I returned to the hotel I found a message to return a telephone call to New York City. One of the first sentences spoken by the person I was talking to was "I am so sorry you are no longer in adult education."

> more than double the participation in such activities five years ago. Should the trend continue at the present rate of growth, the total may well be over a million by 1960. To the public junior college, recognition of major responsibility for adult education, it would seem, has come rather suddenly and somewhat by surprise.... Consequently, adult education as a major activity of the public community college has grown up in a haphazard manner, largely in response to direct pressure from the public.[6]

Forty years later, in the early 1990's, the community colleges can be said to be a major supplier of community based adult education programs in the United States. Of the approximately 4 million enrolled, many participate in programs that emphasize "the community and its needs for services: use of facilities, recreation, community forums and lectures, fine arts, credit short courses, seminars, workshops, conferences, institutes, and art festivals."[7] In this respect, they can be said to have replaced or supplanted the adult education programs carried out by many local public schools during the period covered by this history.

NAPSAE anticipated this change and, writing in the final issue of Pulse, James Miller of the Ohio State Department of

Education and NAPSAE's president in 1981-82 explained ... "recognition of the fact that the public school adult education movement has been expanded and broadened to include community colleges [and] a variety of other providers of adult and continuing education services not envisioned ... when the parent organization was founded in 1951"[8], the name was changed to the National Association for Public Continuing Adult Education. Many state and local associations followed suit.

There are several explanations to account for the community colleges over-taking the elementary-secondary school system as the major supplier of community-based adult education.

1. Historically, many state and local school boards were unable to accept the propriety of the public schools extending their mission beyond that of the education of children and youth. Supported almost universally by the local property tax and, in many states, in the absence of an equalization formula, pressure on the local district to take on an expanded function was strongly resisted even in the face of what was often an obvious need.

2. While support patterns for community colleges vary widely from state to state--and from county to county--generally speaking the tax base is different from that of the so-called "K through 12" school system. It is not, therefore, seen as taking

funds away from childhood education. Additionally, since the primary focus of many of the non-credit programs of the community college is to serve as a catalyst for community economic development, or as a continuing education center for licensed professionals, influential groups within the community can be counted upon to come quickly to the support of the program if and when such support is needed.

3. Many adults, when offered a choice between going "on to college" rather then "back to school" will choose the former.

4. To some extent, adult educators helped weaken their own base of financial support by offering programs that state legislators enjoyed cataloging as "frills". In California, in 1951, a Senate Interim Committee was established to study adult education. In an examination of an adult education program as a social institution, Burton Clark explains that

> ... from the start it was clear that the committee disapproved of many adult-school practices. The senators were interested in economy and an explicit platform of standards for whatever adult education was to be charged to state funds. The committee challenged the program as one having too many "frills".... The committee's attitude epitomized the strict traditionalist view that the program should be limited

> to specifiable categories under close professional control. From this point of view the open-ended type of program [serving community needs as expressed by members of the community] appeared to be governed by nothing more than rank expediency.[9]

Although the Interim Committee's position was recognized as extreme and was vigorously, and largely successfully, opposed by the California Teachers Association, the message relayed was heard across the country. Sam Hand, state director of adult education in Florida and president of NAPSAE in 1960-61, wrote in the Association's 1961 Yearbook that "in New York State, state aid was cut in half, and in Michigan it has been lost entirely. In California and Florida, attempts to eliminate or seriously curtail the program have been successfully resisted, but limitations have been placed upon these programs which make it difficult ... for them to keep pace with normal growth...." In hypothesizing about the reasons for this challenge he said that "we in public school adult education, to a very great extent have been pushing the wrong programs, engaging in the wrong activity, and elaborating the wrong concepts." He asked each of his readers to question whether they were "using public monies appropriated for the education of adults as adult 'education' or for adult recreation and entertainment."[10]

Pin-pointing the Public School's Clientele

Attacks from state legislatures and self-criticism from within the ranks of adult educators had their effect. Favorite targets of those objecting to what they considered "frills"--classes bearing such names as "Dog Obedience Training", "Cake Decorating", and "Basket Weaving" began either to disappear from the promotional catalogs or had a sufficiently high fee attached to cover instructional costs.

For all of this, the force that had the most impact on the adult education curriculum of the public schools and its target audience was not the dead weight of the frills courses. It was not the earnest efforts of the Fund for Adult Education to advance liberal adult education. It was not the Division of Adult Education's National Training Laboratory which did not address the question. It was the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 and subsequent biennial enactments of the Adult Education Act. (Title 3 of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act first passed in 1966.)

The elimination of most low-skill jobs that required only low-level literacy levels created a ready market for programs of Adult Basic Education (ABE). Passage of the Act also provided all states and most local districts with an opportunity to serve adults they could not afford to ignore--particularly since the federal government was prepared to pay ninety percent of the cost.

Faithful to the truism that "every action has a reaction", the response to the sudden embrace of Adult Basic Education by the public school establishment led many adult educators, including some who were members of NAPSAE, to lament that "adult education" was in danger of becoming synonymous with "literacy education." That this was a premature and uninformed judgement will be quickly revealed by any survey of the length and breadth of present-day adult and continuing education offerings by a multitude of public and private agencies.

Personnel Training and Organizational Development

As the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was a precursor of the NEA Division of Adult Education Service, so did waging the war on the home front gave rise to a new educational need--and to a new national organization to deal with it.

Leonard Nadler, one of the prominent interpreters of the theory and methodology of what has come to be known as Human Resource Development, explains that during the second World War, "employers could no longer rely on recruiting skilled workers, but had to hire whomever was available in the work force. This included some people formerly classified as unemployables who had to be made productive in a short time through effective training and education."[11]

Thus a new profession was born made up individuals who could help other individuals improve their job performance--whatever that job might be and at whatever level. Preceding the formation of a national organization of training directors was the growth of both state and industry-wide associations.

In 1942 "the idea of having a national training society that would cut across all industries was suggested ... at a meeting of the American Petroleum Institute committee ... in New Orleans."[12] The organization that emerged, initially named the American Society for Training Directors (ASTD) represented a federation of industry-wide organizations concerned with employee training and state organizations of training directors. Its first journal was issued under the title, Industrial Training News. In 1964 the name of the organization was changed to the American Society for Training and Development. Two years later the periodical was renamed the Training and Development Journal.

It was in 1947, five years after the American Society for Training Directors came into being, that the first National Training Laboratory in Group Development was launched at Bethel, Maine. It soon began receiving as delegates individuals who were members of ASTD. While the ultimate aims of the "Society" and the "Laboratory" were different, both were built around concepts of improving, upgrading, changing, or modifying skills, abilities and behaviors.

In a retrospective look at the interaction between ASTD and NTL, Kenneth Benne has written the following:

> ASTD had originally been concerned with the training of personnel to fit into more or less fixed roles. Training, in this sense, was a low level function in most organizations. NTL had pioneered the notion of organizational development by including as part of its goal structure the idea of changing executives through reeducational experiences; it took organizational structure as a target of change, not just individual members.
>
> This meshed with the objective developed by Alfred Marrow, a board member of NTL, to refocus ASTD on organizational change and development. He wanted NTL to become part of ASTD but Lee Bradford and I resisted because our mission was not limited to industry, business, and government. We wanted various other professions, public and private to participate in NTL. In brief, ASTD learned to refashion its mission, in some measure, from NTL.[13]

There were, of course, areas of common interest within the AEA that also overlapped those of both ASTD and NTL. The story of the influence of NTL on AEA has already been told. Leonard

Nadler, a member of both ASTD and AEA, provides a glimpse of the search for a way to organizationally relate the aims of ASTD and AEA. In a recent letter to the author he describes the reaction of some of the individuals attending the 1957 AEA conference to his having pointed out to them shared interests of both organizations. They became "excited about the possibility of bringing the two groups together." He continued by saying:

> In 1958 we organized a meeting at the IBM club in Binghamton, N.Y. Our host was Tenho Hermanson, director of general education for IBM. In attendance was Len Nadler, Malcolm Knowles, William Levy [director of the National Foremans Institute], George Godow, [director of Human Resource Development for the Pittsburgh Plate and Glass Co.], and two others. We tried to plan how the two [organizations] could come together. The failure of this effort was due to the position of AEA, not Malcolm [Knowles]. AEA at the time was the larger organization and wanted ASTD to become a special interest group in AEA. Of course ASTD could not agree to this.
>
> The only result of that meeting was the founding the following year of the Business and Industry Group in AEA, of which I was the first chairman.[14]

Of somewhat symbolic significance of the intertwined interests of ASTD, NTL, and AEA is that in 1969 Gordon Lippitt, NTL's first assistant director (later associate) and active in AEA was elected president of ASTD.

The relationship of HRD to adult education is illustrated by the placement of the chapter by Karen Watkins on human resource development in the 1990 Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education. It is one of twelve chapters in the section entitled "Major Providers of Educational Programs for Adults" and is entitled "Business and Industry".[15] In the list of references following the chapter, at least five of the authors quoted are well-known for their published articles in journals presently issued by AAACE. Watkins is a professor of adult education and human resource development at the University of Texas.

In terms of the present organization of the field, formal inter-communication between HRD practitioners and practitioners in general adult education, is mainly through overlapping memberships in related professional organizations. If not, necessarily, the best way, it is a functional way to build bridges of understanding between adult education, continuing education, and human resource development. Today, ASTD is one of the largest of the specialist adult education organizations.

The NTL Institute

The NTL Institute, the direct descendant of NEA's National

Training Laboratories is today a thriving "nonprofit association of behavioral scientists dedicated to research and application of methods of improving personal, organizational, and community effectiveness."[16] It continues to use the Conference House at Bethel as a summer conference center. In addition throughout the years, and throughout the United States and Canada, it offers regularly scheduled programs. The purpose of the Institute, as described in its 1991 catalog is "to develop ways of improving the quality and effectiveness of relationships in all aspects of human life. It is committed to the future development of human potential in all persons and groups, to the humanization and democratization of institutions and organizations, and to the elimination of oppression and exploitation in every form of human relationships."[17]

Community Education

Although the NEA was not directly involved, no account of the public schools and adult education would be complete without reference to the community school--or now, more generally--the community education movement.

Throughout this history, reference has been made to community-centered adult education. On occasion, the term "community education" has been used. The context in this account has been that of the involvement of community agencies--often by means of an advisory committee--in planning classroom instruction deemed a necessary part of helping the schools fulfill their obligation to the entire community. As reported in Chapter II, during the Great Depression, this kind of planning--and this kind of educational service--became a priority concern of many school districts.

The specific term "community school" came into use during the time period of this study. In 1935, in Flint, Michigan, thanks to a grant to the Board of Education from the C. S. Mott Foundation, the Ralph M. Freeman Elementary School became the first of Flint's many "community schools". It had been designed for use by a population extending far beyond that of children of elementary school age. Provision had been made for a community conference room, a gymnasium and an auditorium to be used by adults as well as children, an arts and crafts room, and a health center. Perhaps the most significant innovation was the employment of a full-time staff member to serve as a "community school director".

The Flint program exported the concept in several ways. One was the arrangement made with Michigan's seven state universities to provide graduate courses in community education and to provide a stipend for participating students. Many individuals prominent in adult and continuing education today took advantage of this opportunity. Another outreach was the sponsorship of an annual Community School Conference in which adult education practioners and school personnel related to health and recreation programs visited Flint to observe first-hand the actual operation of community schools.

Cooperation between NAPSAE and what was usually referred to as the "Mott Program" was close. Nearly all members of the community school staff were members of NAPSAE, frequently served on its committees, and participated in its conferences. Members of the NAPSAE staff, in turn, regularly attended the Community School Conferences and, as appropriate, helped extend the concept during regular field work.

Today, according to Starla Jewell-Kelly, executive director of the National Community School Association, there are 9,500 community school programs currently operating. Activities may range from in-school workshops arranged to gain community understanding of the science curriculum of the school to parent education classes of all kinds and intervention programs for troubled children and their troubled parents. The Adult Basic Education program is usually included as a part of the community school complex of offerings and includes the involvement of a multitude of community agencies to assist in recruiting students, providing work-related incentives for attendance, and supplying volunteer tutors.

For several years the national office of the National Community School Association was housed in the NEA headquarters building. Today its offices are in Alexandria, Virginia.

NEA's Financial Commitment

Somewhere in this history there must be an accounting of the dollar cost to NEA members of the Association's half-century involvement in adult education and its related support for the National Training Laboratory.

From 1921 through 1951, subsidies to the Department of Immigrant Education and the Department of Adult Education, plus several appropriations to literacy commissions, amounted to $51,000. Appropriations for the Division of Adult Education from 1945 through 1962 amounted to $782,000.

After NTL was separated from the Division of Adult Education, the amount budgeted for adult education was $395,000 and for NTL $348,500. In addition, NEA made a gift to NTL of nearly $24,000, the amount NEA had invested in improvements to the Conference House in Bethel, as well as such furnishings as needed from the Martinque Hotel, then being razed to make way for NEA's new headquarters.

Assuming that the $782,000 budgeted between 1945 and 1962 was divided equally between "adult education" and NTL, which, in general, it was, the amount available to each would be $391,000.

Between 1959 and 1972, $69,200 was budgeted as a phase-out grant to NAPSAE.

The total appropriation for all adult education and NTL operations comes to over $1,250,000. In addition, prior to 1945 the NEA provided custodial services for dues collected and editorial assistance for the two original departments. After 1945 it provided rent-free headquarters, travel arrangements, mail handling, accounting and, as necessary, legal services at no charge to the operating budget of the Division plus fringe benefits (not included in the budgeted appropriation) for all employees. Calculated most conservatively, these contributions might amount to another quarter of a million dollars.

For those willing to accept a bottom-line figure of a million and a half dollars as a minimum figure of NEA's contribution to adult education and related fields (as measured in 1921-1972 currency), these questions can be asked:

1. Did NEA members get value received in terms of contributing to the equalization of educational opportunity?
2. Did the custodians of the funds discharge their obligations prudently?
3. Did the field of adult education profit accordingly?

The first two questions are not for this author to answer.

As to the last, it can be fairly stated that for a half-century, plus one year, the NEA was a significant force in adult education. In what were truly pioneer days, the support given the Departments of Immigrant and Adult Education sustained the only systematic means of communication among the practitioners in the field other than those engaged in general and agricultural extension.

Thirty years later, before the founding of the Fund for Adult Education--and after AAAE had spent the last of its Carnegie funds--the NEA provided a major portion of the staff and support services required to assure the maintenance of an all-inclusive adult education organization. In 1951 it made possible the re-establishment of a professional association for those who worked in the public school's adult education vineyard. Before NEA withdrew from the field in 1972 it had played a major role in securing federal funds to carry on programs of adult elementary and secondary education.

Today, in its resolutions affirming the importance of education for all people, the continuation of categorical support for designated educational programs, its support of community education and of career education, plus a somewhat reluctant endorsement of high school equivalency testing (the Association would sooner see the students graduate), NEA continues to hold to the concept of adult education as an integral part of the nation's educational agenda.

If there were an adult education Hall of Fame, I have no doubt but that the NEA would be afforded a niche appropriate to its many contributions.

Chapter XIV

REFERENCES

1. NEA Proceedings, 1968, p. 7-22.

2. West, Allen, The National Education Association: The Power Base for Education. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1980. p. 26-27.

3. The Pulse of Public School Adult Education. Washington D.C.: The National Association for Public School Adult Education, a department of the National Education Association. 9:2: October 1968.

4. NEA Proceedings, 1969, p. 429.

5. NEA Proceedings, 1971, p. 681.

6. National Education Association, Division of Adult Education Service. A study of Urban Public School Adult Education Programs of the United States. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1952. p. 158.

7. Shearon, Ronald W. and Tollefson, Terrence A. "Community Colleges." In Sharon B. Merran and Phyllis M. Cunningham, (eds.), Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. p. 318.

8. The Pulse of Public Continuing Adult Education. Washington D.C.: The National Association of Public and Continuing Adult Education , a department of the National Education Association. 23:6; September, 1982.

9. Clark, Burton R. Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press. 1956. p. 125-26.

10. Hand, S.E. "Interpreting Our Balance Sheet in Public School Adult Education." Focus on Public School Adult Education. First Yearbook, Washington, D.C.: The National Association of Public School Adult Educators. A department of the NEA. p. 126.

11. Nadler, Leonard and Zeace Nadler. Developing Human Resources. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey - Boss, 1989. p. 29.

12. Miller, Vincent A. "The History of Training." In Robert L. Craig, (ed.) Training and Development Handbook. 3rd ed. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1987. p. 17.

13. Benne, Kenneth D. Correspondence with the author. July 8, 1991.

14. Nadler, Leonard. Correspondence with the author. September 1, 1991.

15. Watkins, Karen E. "Business and Industry." In Sharon B. Merrian and Phyllis M. Cunningham (eds.), Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education. op cit. p. 422-435.

16. NTL Institute. NTL Institute Programs 1991. Arlington VA.: The Institute. p. 38.

17. Ibid. Inside front cover.

About the Author

Prior to the formation of the Adult Education Association of the USA, Robert A. Luke worked with both of the predecessor organizations: as chair of the Community Organization Committee of the American Association for Adult Education, (AAAE) 1947-'48, and as associate executive secretary of the Department of Adult Education of the NEA, 1949-'51. In 1950 he was a member of the Department of Adult Education/AAAE committee that met at Sarah Lawrence College to develop a plan for organizing what was to be named the Adult Education Association of the USA, (AEA).

Before moving to Washington in 1949 he had been employed as state director of the Colorado WPA Library Project, assistant director of the Chicago Adult Education Council, and executive secretary of the Adult Education Council of Metropolitan Cincinnati. From 1949 through 1971 he was employed at the National Education Association first as assistant director of the Division of Adult Education and then as its director. In 1952 he was instrumental in the organization of the National Association of Public School Adult Educators and served as its executive secretary until 1969. He retired from the NEA in 1979 after having served three years as director of a National Institute of Education funded project on teacher in-service education.

From 1949-1956 he was a member of the summer staff of the National Training Laboratories in Group Development in Bethel, Maine and from 1964 through 1975 served as international secretary of the Adult Education Committee of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

Since retiring from the NEA in 1979 he served in 1980-1981 as Senior East Coast Consultant for the AEA and from 1984 through 1988 as a member of the AAACE Publications Standing Service Unit; the final two years as its chair. In 1987 he received the AAACE Outstanding Service Medallion Award and in 1988 the AAACE President's Award.

Note below: Employment at the NEA was continuous from 1949 through 1979. The references to staff work for the Department of Adult Education, AEA, NTL, and NAPSAE represent NEA's support of various aspects of adult education subsidized through the provision of staff, office space, travel and support services.